

EMERGENCY MIGRATION OF ESCAPEES, EXPELLEES, AND REFUGEES

HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY UNITED STATES SENATE EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS FIRST SESSION ON **S. 1917**

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF TWO HUNDRED
AND FORTY THOUSAND SPECIAL QUOTA IMMIGRANT
VISAS TO CERTAIN ESCAPEES, GERMAN EXPELLEES, AND
NATIONALS OF ITALY, GREECE, AND THE NETHERLANDS,
AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 26, 27, 28, AND JULY 1, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, *Chairman*

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin	PAT McCARRAN, Nevada
WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana	HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah	JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey	ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	WILLIS SMITH, North Carolina
HERMAN WELKER, Idaho	OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr., Missouri

STANDING SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey	PAT McCARRAN, Nevada
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia
HERMAN WELKER, Idaho	JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee

RICHARD ARENS, *Staff Counsel*

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter from President Eisenhower to Vice President Nixon.....	2
Text of S. 1917.....	2
Statements of—	
Anderson, Crete, American Legion.....	123, 212
Babcock, Charles E., Junior Order of United American Mechanics.....	215
Belosselsky, Serge, vice president, Federation of Russian Charity Organizations.....	169
Cassavetes, Nicholas J., New York, N. Y.....	176
Crumbholz, Clarence E., National Lutheran Council.....	102
Durkin, Hon. Martin P., Secretary of Labor.....	20
Edelsberg, Herman, B'nai B'rith.....	250
Elliott, A. Roland, Church World Service.....	102
Ferguson, Hon. Homer, Senator from Michigan.....	237
Finucane, James, National Council for the Prevention of War.....	242
Gibbons, Rev. William J., National Catholic Rural Life Conference on Special Immigration.....	231
Gray, George O., Special Assistant for Congressional Relations, Department of State.....	6
Gregory, Richard K., Armenian Church in North America, Union of Evangelical Churches in North America, and Armenian Evangelical and Benevolent Union of America.....	231
Hart, Merwin K., president, National Economic Council.....	117
Heimlich, William F., Washington, D. C.....	198
Horowitz, Daniel L., Bureau of European Affairs, Department of State.....	6
Houghton, Dorothy D., Assistant Director, MSA.....	42
Howard, Mrs. Ernest W., District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs.....	275
Javits, Hon. Jacob K., Representative from the State of New York.....	191
Jordon, George Racey, on behalf of Capt. John B. Trevor, New York, N. Y.....	55, 65
Judd, Hon. Walter H., Representative from Minnesota.....	83
Kohlberg, Alfred, vice president, American China Policy Association, Inc.....	49
Lalos, Arthur H., American-Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.....	230
Leetch, Madeline Dingley, National Society of New England Women and National Society of the Women Descendants of Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.....	186
Loukashkin, Anatole S., San Francisco, Calif.....	169
Lucas, Mrs. James C., Daughters of the American Revolution.....	138
Mackey, Argyle R., Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice.....	25
Malof, Rev. Basil A., president, Russian Bible Society, Inc.....	45
Marchisio, Juvenal, American Committee on Italian Immigration.....	153
Minkunas, Peter, executive director, United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc.....	174
Mitchell, Hugh G., American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.....	225
Morse, Hon. True D., Under Secretary of Agriculture.....	95
Nicolet, Leon, president, Federation of Russian Charity Organizations of the United States.....	169
Panek, Jan, Council of Free Czechoslovakia.....	253
Pasqualicchio, L. H., Order Sons of Italy in America.....	153
Pusta, Kaarel R., chairman, Estonian Aid, Inc.....	240
Quinn, Daniel P., Catholic Committee for Refugees.....	76
Raies, Norman W., Alexandria, Va.....	261

Statements of—Continued	Page
Saltonstall, Hon. Leverett, Senator from Massachusetts.....	64
Smith, Hon. Walter Bedell, Under Secretary of State.....	6
Smith, Hon. Willis, Senator from North Carolina.....	219
Spiegler, Louis E., Jewish War Veterans of the United States.....	213
Swanstrom, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward E., National Catholic Welfare Conference.....	195
Taylor, Blair, executive director, Tolstoy Foundation.....	169
Tinkham, Mrs. Mildred Taft, Hollywood, Calif.....	267
Tolstoy, Alexandra, president, Tolstoy Foundation.....	169
Van Kirk, Walter W., National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.....	102
Vosnjak, Bogumil, former member, Yugoslav Parliament.....	67
Wagner, Peter, president, United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc.....	147
Warren, George L., adviser on refugees, Department of State.....	6
Weber, George W., Veterans' Hospital, Oteen, N. C.....	72
Whately, David, Bethesda, Md.....	264
Williams, George Washington, Society of the War of 1812.....	179
Winings, L. Paul, General Counsel, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice.....	25
Wycislo, Rev. Aloysius J., National Catholic Welfare Conference.....	195
Statements, resolutions, letters, and telegrams:	
American Federation of Labor.....	293
American Friends Service Committee.....	295
American Veterans Committee.....	298
Barakat, George M.....	298
Binford, Mrs. Victor A.....	299
Burant, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix F.....	299
Catholic War Veterans.....	301
Congress of Industrial Organizations.....	302
Criscuolo, Luigi.....	303
Cuite, Thomas J.....	301
Elliott, A. R.....	304
Emple, Dr. Paul C.....	304
Giambalvo, Peter C.....	305
Greenleigh, Arthur.....	304
Griffin, V. P.....	305
Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society.....	305
Heywood, Mrs. Roy E.....	306
Il Progresso Italo-Americano.....	307
Kohier, Mr. and Mrs. Carl J.....	320
Mackey, Argyle R.....	323
Mason, Walter J.....	293
McCarran, Hon. Pat.....	123
Mohler, Bruce M.....	320
Morley, T. J.....	320
National Council of Jewish Women.....	305
National Sojourners, Inc.....	321
New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation.....	322
Polish Immigration Committee.....	299
Pope, Fortune.....	307
Rice, Andrew E.....	298
Reuther, Walter P.....	302
Schulz, John W. N.....	321
Swanstrom, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward E.....	304
Thomas, Mrs. Arthur L.....	323
Thornton, Mrs. Henry W.....	323
United Service for New Americans.....	305
Van Kirk, Dr. Walter W.....	304
Watkins, Hon. Arthur V.....	323
White, Mrs. Ashmead.....	325

EMERGENCY MIGRATION OF ESCAPEES, EXPELLEES, AND REFUGEES

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a. m. in the old Supreme Court room, the Capitol, Senator Arthur V. Watkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Watkins, Hendrickson, and Butler.

Also present: Richard Arens, staff director; Drury Blair, staff member; and O. K. Earl, staff member.

Senator WATKINS. The subcommittee will now be in session.

The hearing to begin today before this subcommittee is for the purpose of considering the President's request directed to Vice President Nixon, President of the Senate, with respect to emergency legislation designed to provide asylum for at least a small portion of the refugees who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain.

In response to the request of the President, S. 1917 was introduced and has been referred to this committee for consideration. This hearing will be confined to the President's request and to this specific bill.

For the record, it should be stated that S. 1917 is in no wise an attempt to amend or revise the Immigration Act of 1952. That act is not before us at the present time. The measure we are now considering is emergency legislation and should in no wise be considered in any other category.

The Immigration Act of 1952 has been in effect for a few short months. It was adopted by more than a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress. Within the act itself was provided the machinery for the study of the effect and operation of the law. The Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality authorized in the law has been fully organized and is making a continual study of the operation of the law. This organization had taken place before the President had written to me as chairman of the Senate Immigration Subcommittee suggesting that the law be studied by the Congress. So, today in this hearing, I suggest that the witnesses presenting their views on the matter now before us confine themselves to the bill S. 1917.

A large number of witnesses have requested time in which to present their views. In order to accommodate as many as possible within the limited time we shall have for consideration of this matter, it will be necessary that witnesses talk to the point and be as brief as possible in presenting their views. I hope that the committee members will

use restraint and direct their questioning to this particular legislation in order to save time and to have a clearcut record. In some cases, witnesses may desire to register their views with the committee by submitting a written statement without personal appearances. This will be permitted and the committee will make the final decision as to how much of the material will actually be finally printed in the record. Actually, we should not print in the record a lot of irrelevant matter that will have nothing to do with the particular legislation under consideration and which would only encumber the record.

At this point, I am going to read into the record the letter from the President to the President of the Senate.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 22, 1953.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are all aware of the tragic developments of the past several years which have left countless thousands of individuals homeless refugees in the heart of Europe. In recent months, the number of refugees has been increased by the steady flow of escapees who have braved death to escape from behind the Iron Curtain. These refugees and escapees searching desperately for freedom look to the free world for haven.

In addition, the problem of population pressures continues to be a source of urgent concern in several friendly countries in Europe.

It is imperative that we join with the other nations in helping to find a solution to these grave questions. These refugees, escapees, and distressed peoples now constitute an economic and political threat of constantly growing magnitude. They look to traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. International political considerations are also factors which are involved. We should take reasonable steps to help these people to the extent that we share the obligation of the free world.

Therefore, after consideration of all the points of view which have been presented, I recommend, within the framework of the immigration laws, the enactment of emergency immigration legislation for the special admission of 120,000 immigrants per year for the next 2 years.

In order to help resolve this current immigration and refugee problem in the tradition of our American policy, I urge that the Congress give this recommendation its earliest consideration.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

At this point we will place in the record the bill, S. 1917.

[S. 1917, 83d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To authorize the issuance of two hundred and forty thousand special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Migration Act of 1953."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act the term—

(a) "Escapee" means any person who, during or after World War II has left the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or other Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied area of Europe, including those parts of Germany under military occupation by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and who because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion refuses to return thereto and who has not been firmly resettled.

(b) "German expellee" means any person of German ethnic origin residing in the area of the German Federal Republic, Western sector of Berlin, or in Austria who was born in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, or areas provisionally under the administration or control or domination of any such countries, except the Soviet zone of military occupation of Germany, and who has not been firmly resettled.

(c) "National" as used in this Act shall mean a person owing permanent allegiance to and having full rights of citizenship in a state as of the effective date of this Act.

SPECIAL QUOTA VISAS; NUMBERS

SEC. 3. There is hereby established a special quota of two hundred and forty thousand which may be used as provided by section 4 of this Act, during the two years beginning one hundred and twenty days after the enactment of this Act, for the issuance of immigrant visas to aliens seeking to enter the United States as immigrants and to their spouses and their unmarried children under twenty-one years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren, if accompanying them: *Provided*, That sections 201, 202, and 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (86 Stat. 175-178), shall not be held to be applicable to any alien to whom an immigrant visa shall be issued under this Act: *And provided further*, That no alien shall be issued a visa under this Act and no such alien shall be admitted into the United States unless he is eligible under the Immigration and Nationality Act (86 Stat. 163), except as specifically provided in this Act.

ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL QUOTA VISAS

SEC. 4. (a) Special quota immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 3 of this Act shall be allotted as follows:

(1) Not to exceed one hundred and ten thousand visas to escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(2) Not to exceed fifteen thousand visas to escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey or in the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(3) Not to exceed seventy-five thousand visas to nationals of Italy or persons of Italian ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this Act in Italy or in the Free Territory of Trieste: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(4) Not to exceed twenty thousand visas to nationals of Greece or persons of Greek ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this Act in Greece: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in Greece.

(5) Not to exceed twenty thousand visas to nationals of the Netherlands or persons of Dutch ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this Act in metropolitan Netherlands: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in metropolitan Netherlands.

(b) The allotments provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be available for the issuance of immigrant visas to the spouses and children, referred to in section 3 of this Act, of persons defined in subsection (a) of this section.

EMERGENCY MIGRATION COORDINATOR

SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act—

(a) The Emergency Migration Coordinator, hereinafter referred to as the "Coordinator" shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a rate of compensation not in excess of \$17,500.

(b) The Coordinator may exercise any power, function, or authority conferred upon him by this Act through such agencies, officers or employees of the United States as he shall designate, appoint, or employ, utilizing to the maximum extent practicable the services of existing agencies, officers, or employees of the United States.

(c) Any funds authorized to be appropriated hereunder may be allocated by the Coordinator to any agency and such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with authority granted hereunder or under the authority governing the activities of the agency to which such funds are allocated.

(d) The Coordinator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(e) The Coordinator shall report to the President and the Congress on the operations of the program established under this Act at the end of each of the two years of such program. Such reports shall include full and complete details respecting the administration of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes provided for in section 14 of the Act including the names of the persons and organizations to whom loans shall be made and the amount of such loans.

ASSURANCES; GOOD FAITH DATA

Sec. 6. (a) In accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to section 5 (d) of this Act assurances shall be executed by a citizen or citizens of the United States and submitted to the coordinator. Such assurances shall state that persons who qualify under section 4 of this Act, but not their spouses and children, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment, and that any such person and his spouse and children who propose to live with him will not become public charges, and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing.

(b) No visa shall be issued to any alien whose admission under this Act is based on the submission of an assurance made under subsection (a) of this section, unless he shall first execute a signed statement under oath or affirmation that he accepts and agrees in good faith to abide by the terms of employment provided for him in the assurance upon which his application for a visa under this Act is based. The responsible consular officer is hereby authorized and empowered to administer such oath or take such affirmation for this purpose and to designate employees who shall have power to administer such oath or affirmation: *Provided*, That upon a finding by the Attorney General that such statement was falsely made it shall be deemed to be a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as provided for in section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 183): *Provided further*, That in determining whether or not the person accepted and agreed in good faith to abide by the said terms of employment the Attorney General shall consider the manner, conditions, extent, and duration of the person's employment after admission into the United States. Such alien and any alien found to have been inadmissible under the provisions of this Act at the time of entry shall, irrespective of the date of his entry, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided by sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 208-214).

(c) Neither subsection (a) nor (b) of this section shall have applicability if the alien provides satisfactory evidence under the Immigration and Nationality Act that he will not become a public charge.

(d) Assistance rendered an alien in connection with his transportation to and resettlement in the United States shall not be regarded as a cause for excludability as an alien likely to become a public charge.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ARRANGEMENTS

Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary of State may, for the purposes of this Act, make such arrangements with foreign governments as are necessary and appropriate for the purpose of financing and insuring the voluntary movement of migrants, such arrangements to be mutually beneficial to the economies of the United States and the countries concerned, as well as to the individual migrants and their families. Such arrangements, where appropriate, may seek to enable immigrants under this Act to transfer into dollar currency personal assets necessary for defraying the cost of transportation and for use in the United States. Arrangements between the United States and the other governments concerned should also provide for such cooperation and assistance as may be required in the administration of the program authorized under this Act in the territory of the intending immigrant's residence.

(b) The Secretary of State may also make such arrangements with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration as are necessary and appropriate for the purpose of facilitating the transportation of aliens receiving visas under this Act to the port of entry in the United States.

SELECTION WITHOUT DISCRIMINATIONS

Sec. 8. (a) Within the categories established in section 4 of this Act the determination of the eligibility of persons to receive visas and of the admissibility of such persons into the United States under this Act shall be made without discrimination in favor of or against race, religion, or national origin of such persons.

EXEMPTIONS FROM VISA FEES

Sec. 9. Persons receiving visas under this Act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230-231).

SECURITY AND OTHER INVESTIGATION; EFFECT OF MISREPRESENTATION

SEC. 10. No alien shall be issued a visa under this Act, or be admitted into the United States, unless there shall have been first a thorough investigation by such agency or agencies of the Government of the United States as may be designated by the President regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under this Act. Any person who shall willfully make a material misrepresentation to any agency of the Government entrusted directly or indirectly with the administration, investigation, enforcement, or any other function relating to the implementation of this Act, for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an alien eligible hereunder, shall be excluded from admission into the United States under section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 183); and no person shall be issued an immigrant visa or be admitted into the United States under this Act, if the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State or the consular officer or immigrant officer knows or has reason to believe that the alien is subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws or is not eligible under the terms of this Act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall remove the right of review and appeal available to aliens under the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163).

PRIORITIES

SEC. 11. Priorities in the consideration of visa applications under this Act, without priority in time of issuance of visas as between such priorities or as between priority and nonpriority cases under this Act, shall be given to—

(1) persons who are farm workers and persons whose services or skills are needed in the United States, if such need has been certified to the Coordinator, by the United States Department of Labor; and

(2) persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the common law.

PERSONS INELIGIBLE; OATH ON ADMISSION; PENALTIES

SEC. 12. (a) No visa shall be issued under this Act to any person who personally advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person or group of persons because of race, religion, or national origin.

(b) Before being issued a visa every alien eighteen years of age or older, authorized to be admitted under this Act, shall take and subscribe an oath or affirmation that he is not and never has been a person specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), or (H) of section 212 (a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 184-186), except as provided in subparagraph (I) of such sections, and shall be liable to prosecution for perjury if such oath or affirmation is willfully false. If any alien not entitled to be issued a visa under this Act and not entitled to be admitted into the United States shall nevertheless gain admission, such alien shall, regardless of the date of his entry, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided in sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 208-214).

(c) Any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of this Act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$10,000 or shall be imprisoned not less than two or more than ten years, or both.

APPLICABILITY OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

SEC. 13. Except as otherwise provided by this Act all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be applicable under this Act.

LOANS

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Coordinator is authorized and directed to make loans not to exceed \$10,000,000 in the aggregate, to public or private agencies for the purpose of financing the ocean transportation and the reception and transportation from ports of entry within the United States to the places of their resettlement, of persons receiving immigrant visas under this Act, and who lack resources to finance the expenses involved. Such loans, which shall mature not later than June 30, 1960, shall be made under rules and regulations approved by the Coordinator.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Coordinator such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Senator WATKINS. May I say that there are 18 Senators altogether who are sponsoring this particular legislation?

We have with us a number of men from the executive department who will testify during the day. General Smith, Under Secretary of State; Mr. Durkin, Secretary of Labor; Mr. Mackey, Commissioner of Immigration, and others whose names have not been given to me at the moment. I think the first witness we will call this morning will be General Smith, Under Secretary of State.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER BEDELL SMITH, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, ACCOMPANIED BY GEORGE O. GRAY, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS; DANIEL L. HOROWITZ, BUREAU OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS; AND GEORGE L. WARREN, ADVISER ON REFUGEES, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have a rather lengthy statement in support of this bill. The text of that statement Mr. Arens already has. The contents of it, I may say, you are about as thoroughly familiar with as I am. Since this is a public hearing, would you wish me to read this statement into the record?

Senator WATKINS. I believe you should, General.

Mr. SMITH. Very well, I shall proceed.

As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, in his letter of April 22 to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, which you have just cited, President Eisenhower pointed to the strategic developments which left countless thousands of homeless refugees in Europe and referred to the steady flow of persons escaping from Communist oppression to seek asylum in the free world. The President also pointed to the problem of population pressures as a source of urgent concern in several friendly countries in Europe. As a contribution to the solution, the President urged earliest consideration for his recommendations for emergency immigration legislation. After careful study, the Department of State believes that the bill introduced by you, Mr. Chairman, and 17 of your colleagues (S. 1917) will go a long way toward meeting the needs outlined by the President.

The Department of State is interested in the proposed legislation primarily because of its foreign-policy implications. The humanitarian aspects of the program are obvious. Its effect upon our relations with our European allies will be most favorable. It will assist in relieving situations which, under certain circumstances, would adversely affect the national security of the United States by undermining the economic and political stability of our allies.

We are faced with a number of very serious problems having an important impact on the political, economic, and social life of friendly countries in Europe. Some of these problems are a direct outgrowth of World War II; others, as you know, trace their origin to totalitarianism. They are problems of population pressures and of escape from persecution and they are creating situations in certain European

areas which constitute a grave threat to important objectives of American foreign policy. During and after World War II the pressures from basic overpopulation increased tremendously. This is attributable in part to the virtual cessation of migration during the war years. Millions of people became refugees; other millions, because they were Germans, were expelled from their homes in Eastern Europe. There has also been a steady stream of persons fleeing to freedom from Communist terror in Eastern Europe.

Most of the nations of the free world have made a considerable effort to alleviate this situation. Through our own Displaced Persons Act of 1948, this Government admitted about 350,000 refugees from Germany, Austria, and Italy. Through the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the United States and 21 other governments, including Australia, Canada, Israel, 12 Western European and 6 Latin American countries, have worked conscientiously to help in the solution of this problem. This committee, with United States assistance and leadership, hopes to move 120,000 from Europe in 1953 and 140,000 in 1954.

Various countries have participated substantially in receiving migrants from Europe. It is estimated that about 350,000 migrants are moving annually to overseas countries. Since 1945, Canada has admitted approximately 775,000 immigrants from Europe; Australia 720,000; Latin American countries about 125,000 annually. It is hoped that under United States leadership other nations will further increase their level of immigration from Europe.

The problem to which S. 1917 is addressed is one of great concern both to this Government and to our North Atlantic Treaty allies. It is imperative to reduce the population backlog created during the war and postwar years and recently aggravated by the flow of escapees from countries under Communist control. Serious economic and social problems have been created in areas of overpopulation and where refugees and escapees have concentrated. And not the least serious is that these problems become a factor in the growth of communism. The result is a drain on the economies of our Western European partners. Despite outside assistance they have had to bear the principal burden themselves. As a matter of fact, West Germany right now is like a sponge which has reached its absorptive capacity.

Senator WATKINS. Since you made that statement, may I ask you is there any truth to the statement that has been made rather frequently that West Germany does not want to have any of its people leave for other countries?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; there is not. There is truth to the statement that the West German quota is not oversubscribed. There is a very excellent reason for that fact. It costs \$120 to get from West Germany to the United States, as a minimum. The West German Government provides \$60 per person to those willing to immigrate. There are provisions in this bill, and in the implications contained therein, which will make it possible for those people to immigrate. I assure you that the ones who wish to do so are far in excess of any quota provided.

Senator WATKINS. That has been a matter that has received some attention, I know, among the Members of the Congress. The impression has become rather widespread that Mr. Adenauer and other Ger-

man officials were very much against Germans migrating and that they wanted to keep as many as they could at home.

Mr. SMITH. That report is incorrect, Mr. Chairman, and beyond what I have said I will be glad to elaborate a little more after I have finished this, because it is a rather interesting condition which you gentlemen will have gone a long way to alleviate.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. SMITH. West Germany and other countries have absorbed a large proportion of the backlog into their own economies, but they cannot handle this problem alone. Only through adequate emigration opportunities can the population pressures be reduced to manageable proportions.

S. 1917 seeks to contribute to a solution of two problems. One relates to overpopulation; the other to refugees—German expellees and escapees from communism. I believe it important to emphasize that S. 1917 seeks to meet these problems within, and I repeat, the framework of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Senator WATKINS. There is no effort or no desire on the part of the administration at this time to propose amendments to the act of 1952 which was adopted by the Congress?

Mr. SMITH. There is not, sir. As a matter of fact, the safeguards which are provided in that act will, to a certain extent, be intensified by the procedures provided in S. 1917.

Senator HENDRICKSON. The chairman is referring to the McCarran Act?

Senator WATKINS. That is right. I think in the act it is referred to as the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I was giving its official title.

Mr. SMITH. Insofar as this bill is concerned, and while I do not know the administration's position with regard to the entire act, as they affect this legislation, I know of no intention to suggest any change.

Senator WATKINS. A number of newspapers and columnists, I think, commentators, took the position that the letter¹ that the President addressed to me with respect to criticisms that have been made to him, was in effect an effort to get us to amend that act. Of course, that is contrary to the statement that the President made in the letter. He said that these criticisms had been made and he in effect was passing them on to us and hoped we would study them. I want to make that clear because the committee did not consider it as a request in any sense of the term for any amendment of the 1952 act.

Mr. GRAY. I believe the letter to you, contained no reference to quotas, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Before I proceed, may I identify these gentlemen who are with me. From time to time, since they are experts and I am not, they will pop up with an answer to a question which they think I may not be able to answer, and in most cases they will be right. This is Mr. Gray from my office, who has devoted himself to a very careful study; Mr. George Gray.

Mr. GRAY. And Mr. Daniel Horowitz from our European Affairs Bureau. And Mr. George Warren, who is our specialist on refugees.

¹ Letter from President Eisenhower to Senator Watkins, dated April 6, 1953, enumerating criticisms of the act and requesting study of such criticisms.

Senator WATKINS. We are glad to have all of you gentlemen here. You may proceed.

Mr. SMITH. The security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act will be fully complied with. The screening of candidates for admission will be fully as rigorous as that provided under normal immigration. As a matter of fact, in my own opinion and in that of my associates, more so.

Senator WATKINS. You do not want anything stronger than the 1952 act, do you?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; but there are certain provisions which you will note when we get through here that provide even a little more screening abroad than we get. That is, of course, screening at the source which has an additional reenforcement. To protect the American labor market—and incidentally the questions with regard to the problems of screening and labor are better answered, of course, by the immigration and labor authorities who are going to testify—from undue overcrowding the bill which you have sponsored contains provisions going beyond those set forth in the Immigration and Nationality Act. The Labor and Agriculture Departments will describe the process by which migrants under this program will have been assured of suitable employment prior to the issuance of a visa, and that is protective. They will testify on the impact of the program on the domestic economy, which is a matter of concern to you.

S. 1917 is a temporary, and I repeat temporary, measure which does not alter or amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is designed to meet an emergency situation through the issuance of 240,000 special quota visas over a 2-year period.

Senator WATKINS. At this point may I ask you if this is an emergency measure which is likely to be requested again and again?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, I cannot answer for the future, Mr. Chairman, but as you will see, when I go along with my statement—and I might just as well amplify it here in my own words—we have a peculiar situation which exists as the aftermath of war and persecution. If that situation is alleviated, this emergency situation, it is our belief that normal conditions will take care of it in the future. I think I cover that a little more in detail.

Senator BUTLER. The normal expectation is that this provision of this bill will alleviate that situation.

Mr. SMITH. It will begin to alleviate it, and we expect that our associates and allies will take further steps.

Senator BUTLER. It is conditioned, then, to some degree upon the steps which our associates take?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. Have we any assurances from them?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, we do have. As you will note, I will refer to that a little later, if I may.

Senator WATKINS. May I say, Mr. Smith, the reason I asked that question is because I personally have been assured that this will not be a recurring emergency, and that this probably will be the only request that will be made by the President and the administration, at least for legislation of this kind.

Mr. SMITH. Such is my belief, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. I am not attempting to quote anybody on that, but that is the assurance that has come to me, and I have given that

assurance to Members of the Senate who have joined with me in sponsoring this legislation, although some of them would not care if we had to come back time and time again. But others probably would not be willing to support it if they thought there were going to be a series of emergencies such as we have had for the last 20 years, one after another.

That is the reason I am asking that question, because I think it is important for us to know, that we are not going to try to make this a permanent situation, or a permanent expansion of the 1952 act.

Mr. SMITH. No. I am glad you asked the question that way, Mr. Chairman. I am glad you emphasized that fact. There is no intention of coming back next year and saying the emergency still goes on and give us another 240,000.

Senator WATKINS. You will have 120,000 for next year, of course.

Mr. SMITH. Let's say the year after next.

Senator BUTLER. And also may I suggest, General, that our allies and friends have not lived up to their part of the bargain within this framework.

Mr. SMITH. They have done a great deal, Senator, surprisingly so, as a matter of fact. I was myself surprised when I went into it. I would like to cover that a little more.

Senator HENDRICKSON. Certainly Germany has, have they not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, they have. As I say, they have reached their absolute limit of absorption. I want to say also, Mr. Chairman, that I agree with you completely when you said at the time you introduced S. 1917, "All the necessary protection with respect to security are provided for in this bill. In no manner do the requirements differ from those of the Internal Security Act or the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act." I think we have reemphasized that again this morning.

Incidentally, you pointed to another basic fact, which I should like to emphasize, when you said:

The selection of immigrants * * * is to be carried out exclusively by officials of the United States Government. Without exception, all determinations of eligibility and admissibility will be made by officials of this Government.

That is a perfectly correct statement, and that does, to a certain extent, reinforce the provisions of the act, the McCarran Act.

Senator WATKINS. I am glad you made that statement because there has been a lot of criticism of the Administrator of the Displaced Persons Commission in connection with the admission of people to this country. Certain standards were set up and required, but we understand that the Administrator decided to take what he called a calculated risk and admit many people under that program who later were determined to be somewhat undesirable.

Mr. SMITH. Where matters of security are involved, I think that I would be speaking your own minds when I say that you do not take calculated risks if you can avoid doing so.

Senator BUTLER. General, have you given any thought or have you any preconceived idea of where these people, if admitted, will be located within the country?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; we have.

Senator BUTLER. That we will hear about later?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. If you will permit me, sir, I cover that to a certain extent in my statement, and I would like to elaborate on it a little bit afterward.

Gentlemen, the program proposed by the bill would enable us, over a 2-year period, to admit 110,000 escapees and expellees now crowded into the western zones of Berlin, West Germany, and Austria. S. 1917 defines an "escapee" as anyone who has left the Soviet Union or other Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied areas of Europe, and has refused to return to these areas. Persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions is the established yardstick. And one which I am certain will recommend itself to you.

An "expellee" is any person of German ethnic origin, expelled from Eastern Europe, who is now residing in Berlin, Western Germany, or Austria. Both in the case of the escapee and in the case of the expellee, only those who are not firmly resettled are eligible.

Well over 8 million people, expellees and escapees from communism, have already been absorbed by the Federal Republic of Germany.

Gentlemen, that is quite a bit of absorption.

Senator BUTLER. General, may I interrupt again? At that point, has not our aid to Western Germany or to the Federal Republic of Germany been a contributing factor?

Mr. SMITH. It has indeed.

Senator BUTLER. If we slacken that aid, will they be able to carry on?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; they will not. There is an economy which, for our own interests and the interest of our own security cannot be allowed to deteriorate. They are close to the center of the virus of communism. Of course, they are particularly susceptible. As I said in my testimony to the House committee, while it is a great oversimplification to say that no man who owns two shirts is a Communist, the fact remains that it is in the empty belly and the cold back that that virus develops. It is very much to our interest and to the interest of our national security to prevent conditions which will cause its spread.

I am glad you brought that up, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Could you tell us how the Germans, just a brief statement, how the West German Republic has absorbed these people? Does it have them, for instance, in camps where they are kept?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; it has absorbed them into its own economy. Of course they are taken care of first in camps where they have to be received. And then they go to industry and agriculture.

Senator WATKINS. How were they housed?

Mr. SMITH. They were housed as best they could, sir. I saw some of those camps at the end of the war, and they were deplorable by our standards. But to those poor people who had fled from the terrors of communism and who had set up their little housekeeping, families, I may say, and cultured, and some of them very fine people, in about the space provided by these two pillars in front of you, and were keeping them clean and decent and neat and livable until they could make another life, were giving a rather remarkable demonstration of the determination to survive under freedom.

Senator WATKINS. You are now describing the conditions when they were in the camps?

Mr. SMITH. The conditions. They have now been greatly improved by the fact that the German Government has inherited certain facilities that we had during the war, our own cantonment areas, things of that sort, which have been used. As rapidly as possible they are absorbed into the economy of the country, in industry, in agriculture, many of them in the professions. It is remarkable what some of them have done. I talked the day before yesterday to Mr. Victor Kravchenko, who wrote the book *I Chose Freedom*. Mr. Kravchenko told me that last year he paid \$310,000 income tax to the United States Government. He has done pretty well. They don't all do that well, but I wish they would.

Senator WATKINS. That gives us a general picture. The thing that has been important in the minds of many of the Members of the Congress is the question of unemployment among the Germans, for instance, and their housing. We wonder how they had absorbed that number of people and whether they actually had them at work.

Mr. SMITH. They absorbed that number, but they cannot absorb any more. As I told you, the economy of West Germany is like a sponge that has soaked up every last drop of water which it can absorb. Now they are overburdened, they have more population than the economy, the industry of the country can absorb. That in itself is a very serious danger, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have an estimate of the number that they can absorb?

Mr. SMITH. I think that this million is just about the limit. It is believed that as their economy increases, and one of my associates has handed me a figure of a million and a quarter more, possibly.

Senator WATKINS. That they can take care of?

Mr. SMITH. That they can absorb. Excuse me, sir.

Mr. WARREN. The million and a quarter are in the main landless peasants who cannot be absorbed at the present time.

Mr. SMITH. The question is, if I understood it correctly, how many more do we estimate the economy of West Germany can absorb. Do you know the answer?

Obviously we do not, sir. May I get an estimate of that and provide it to the committee?

Senator WATKINS. I think it would be very interesting to us to know. If they can absorb them over there, and integration will take care of the problem rather than migration, then it probably ought to be done that way.

Mr. SMITH. Based on only my knowledge and my own observation, I should say, as I have described to you before, they have reached the limit of their absorptive capacity. It is true that as the industry of West Germany improves and expands, and it is improving and expanding, there will be an additional capacity for absorption. Just what that is, I do not know. But we have some people here in Washington, both in the State Department and elsewhere, who are making very careful studies of the graphic rise of industrial expansion in Germany and elsewhere. I believe that we could give you an estimate.

Senator WATKINS. How has their recovery progressed compared to the other nations?

Mr. SMITH. I could answer that in one word, sir: It has been remarkable.

Senator WATKINS. Have they made as good progress as the other nations around them, as France and Holland? Have they made equal progress with France, Belgium, and Holland and Luxembourg?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator HENDRICKSON. Much better.

Mr. SMITH. Much better, yes.

Senator WATKINS. I want it in the record that a good many people have stated that it is all right to help people who are helping themselves, and if the Germans are doing a good job in helping themselves under the very adverse conditions they have had, there would be more of a tendency to help them out by taking some of this excess population.

Senator BUTLER. I toured Germany less than a year ago, and I have never seen a country which has made such rapid strides toward recovery. They are doing a remarkable job.

Mr. GRAY. On that million and a quarter figure, Mr. Chairman—

Senator BUTLER. I can say that I have seen it before, and anybody that goes to East Germany and sees the condition there and then walks across the line and sees the condition in West Germany, has seen it before and afterwards.

Mr. SMITH. I thought General Clay put it in one sentence. When I came back from Moscow during the Berlin blockade they were building the new airfield to take care of our airlift. I was remarking on the enormous progress that had been made in a month. He said, "You give these people a job to do and you better get out of their way or they will trample you to death getting it done."

Senator BUTLER. General, the productive capacity of West Germany has increased tremendously over the last several years.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator BUTLER. What is their market? Are we their chief market?

Mr. SMITH. That I cannot answer, sir.

Mr. GRAY. We will get some figures on that.

Senator HENDRICKSON. General, if they had adequate housing in the great industrial areas of Germany, would not industry thereby be able to assimilate this population?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir. It is a matter, as Senator Butler just asked about, of outlets. They can make up to a certain point, but they have to have markets. As you know, the problem of markets, world markets, is an acute one. When you get into that problem, you get into ramifications that I would become lost in if I undertook to discuss them with you. But there is a limit to what Germany can produce and sell, or what she can produce and use. As you know, the industrial areas of Germany are extremely congested anyway. I fought or saw the fighting through the Ruhr, which is just one enormous building. It is just about that. There is a limit both as to space and as to productive capacity in terms of ability to dispose of the product. That, you must realize very clearly because if it were not for that, I should say that the Germans could absorb a very large number beyond what they already have. The simple fact is that they are circumscribed by the factors of actual space and actual ability to get rid of by sale or otherwise what they produce.

Senator HENDRICKSON. The reason I asked that question, General, was because last year, when I was over there with a subcommittee of

the Judiciary Committee looking into the refugee problem, we were told by the ministry that if they had adequate housing in some of these industrial areas they could absorb this excess population.

Mr. SMITH. You see, I am afraid that is only one phase of the answer.

Senator HENDRICKSON. The Minister referred particularly to the Ruhr, the Ruhr area.

Mr. SMITH. They could certainly, if they had additional housing, put them to work. If they put them all to work they could turn out a lot more stuff. If they turn out more end items then they begin to get into the economy of Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg, and the coal-steel empire of France and the Saar. It is an extremely complex problem. I could go on about it indefinitely and the headaches it causes us. But actually, I think what you say, while accepting it as correct, it must be limited by the fact that industry can expand only to the point that it is able to get rid of its product by sale or otherwise.

Senator HENDRICKSON. Thank you, General.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. SMITH. Large numbers cannot be absorbed for reasons I have stated, and the problem has been aggravated by a steady influx of those fleeing west from the oppressive heel of totalitarianism.

I may say we have been encouraging them to flee west to seek freedom.

Senator BUTLER. General, have we actually been encouraging that migration?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, we have, but not as actively as we would like to do, because we have this problem to face.

Senator BUTLER. I mean, that puts sort of a new light on this bill, as far as I am concerned, if we have been actively inviting these people or doing things to lead them to believe that they would be welcome.

Mr. SMITH. Let's put it this way: We have been doing it rather tepidly, because if we were really to hoist the banner and say "come one, come all, here is freedom, work, and a decent standard of living," God knows what might happen.

Senator BUTLER. You would be met by a couple of things. You could not furnish the promised incentives.

Senator WATKINS. And secondly, you could not take care of the people who came.

Mr. SMITH. The fact is, sir, that the flow of East European escapees has materially added to the problem, not only in Germany but even more so in Austria. It is toward these problems that the admission of 110,000 escapees and expellees now in Western Berlin, Western Germany, and Austria is directed.

S. 1917 provides for the admission of another 15,000 escapees from communism now in the European territories of our NATO partners, including Turkey, and in Trieste.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at that point?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. Why have we not been more active, General, in returning Trieste to Italy?

Mr. SMITH. Could I be excused from answering that very complex problem?

Senator BUTLER. I think this has a lot to do with this problem in that part of the world.

Mr. SMITH. I may say there are two conflicting opinions on whom Trieste should belong to, and we are trying to reconcile those conflicting opinions.

Senator BUTLER. But were we not under some obligation to see that Trieste was returned to Italy?

Mr. SMITH. Not a direct obligation, sir, and we recognize the implications of the problem, not only on the two major parties involved, but also on their neighbors. We are trying, by diplomatic means, to reconcile those views and to produce a settlement in Trieste. Occasionally we are buoyed up with hope and then something happens and we are cast down in despair.

Senator BUTLER. Do you not think that would alleviate the problem insofar as these NATO nations are concerned?

Mr. SMITH. It would do a little, but not a great deal because there, again, you are dealing with a densely populated area.

Senator BUTLER. You do not contend this is a question that can be cured by immigration. It is not a question of immigration, is it?

Mr. SMITH. No. I was about to say that anything which contributes to the economic and political stability of all of those countries and the flow back and forth of seasonal labor and their ability to absorb excess populations when needed, is an enormous help. Granted that what we are supporting in your bill is a gesture, it is an important gesture, and it is one which will be followed. But it is not the cure. The great contributions which these escapees have made here and in other western nations are well known to this committee.

The remaining special quota numbers are made available to qualified persons from the territories of our NATO partners, Italy, the Netherlands, and Greece.

Now with regard to Italy, Italy's struggle to meet her overpopulation problem is well known. The President's letter of April 22 was received enthusiastically by the Foreign Ministers at the April meeting of the North Atlantic Council, offering as it did hope that help might be in sight for our common allies. All members of the North Atlantic Council have been deeply concerned with this problem and various plans for increasing mobility of labor in Europe are being explored.

In Italy the population problem is not a permanent and insoluble one.

Senator BUTLER. Is that in any way putting America in the position of patronizing those countries by interfering with their internal problems to the point of alienating them?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; it is not. They are tickled to death about it, because they are confronted with these temporary problems. When I discuss the problem of Italy, which is one of the real outstanding examples of what we believe to be a temporary condition, the result of happenings over a period of years, then you will see exactly what I am shooting at.

Senator BUTLER. So it can be said if there are points of aggravation, this is not one of them.

Mr. SMITH. In Italy, the problem results largely from the policy of the Mussolini regime of discouraging normal emigration; the high birthrate of the 1930's; the cessation of emigration during the war;

and the influx of approximately one-half million people from the former Italian colonies and from Istria and Venezia Giulia. You know yourself, you have been through there, that what Mussolini was concerned with initially was breeding cannon fodder in quantities, and then he wanted to establish an overseas empire, which he did. He got all of the excess to emigrate and then, as a result of the war, they poured back into Italy. That is a little bit of oversimplification, but really, in brief, that is just about what occurred.

In the postwar period, Italy's birthrate, and this surprised me, has been below that of most West European countries. The current birthrate is 17.6 per 1,000 population, compared, for example, with 19.4 for France and 24.6 for the United States. We think of the Italian problem, and the first thing that pops into your mind is that all have big families, everybody has a lot of kids. So there is no answer as long as the physical limits of Italy remain what they are. Actually, their birthrate is considerably lower than our own. We are confronting, as I told you, a temporary problem. Of course, to help solve that problem, Senator Butler, would be actually to materially strengthen Premier DeGasperi's position, and we will help him—although this is not entirely germane to the issue, yet it does have to do with our national security—will help him and his coalition of free parties in the coming general election.

Senator WATKINS. I have a question at this point. The bill itself provides for the receiving of some 75,000 Italian nationals.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Would these people who have returned from Ethiopia and from North Africa, and from Trieste, who come back to Italy qualify under that description?

Mr. SMITH. Some of them might, sir. You see, they were mostly farmers who went to Ethiopia. Mussolini wanted to make that a grain-producing area which would feed Italy. So he encouraged agricultural labor to go down there. Now, we can use a certain amount of agricultural labor, too. One of the things we would like to avoid, and there are certain safeguards in this bill, is having people come over for work in small towns, or areas where labor is needed as determined by the Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture, and then immediately abandon that and drift, segregate, back into the cities again.

It is conceivable that many of those farmers, sent as immigrants to North Africa and Ethiopia might, or their oldest sons might, qualify. You must not consider those in the sense of invading soldiers. They were colonizers.

Senator WATKINS. They were refugees, and the probability is that they still retain their Italian nationality.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. They are back in Italy now.

Senator WATKINS. The reason I am calling this to your attention is because there has been some criticism of the bill because it apparently goes into some of the excess population problems of Europe, the ordinary ones that have an excess population, and not particularly is it aimed at refugees. If these people can qualify as Italian nationals then from your description of them they would certainly come within the priorities mentioned in the bill itself, and one of the priorities is for farmers.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, they would. And they are Italian nationals, Mr. Chairman, all of them.

Senator WATKINS. If they are Italian nationals and we give preference and priority to farmers and to relatives of people already over here, then we could meet one of the pressing needs we have in certain parts of the United States in getting farm labor.

Mr. SMITH. These are Italian nationals, per se, and those people that came back, that were evacuated from the Italian overseas colonies, established by force of arms.

Senator WATKINS. If there is any doubt in this bill whether or not they would be eligible, you would agree, would you not, that the bill ought to be amended to recruit and make it possible to give priority to that class of people?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. But there is no doubt on that score.

Senator BUTLER. General, before we leave that subject, it is not clear how this bill would work in connection with elections. Would you make a brief statement?

Mr. SMITH. I think I can make a brief statement quickly. The big problem in every Italian election is an economic problem. The economic pressures are terrific. There is solemn poverty in central and south central Italy. I revert to the simile of the man with two shirts. Most of those people now do not even own one. A lot of that is due to pressure of overpopulation. No Italian Government, during the past 15 years, has actually had a strong enough majority to establish the necessary agrarian reforms at one time, at one wallop, that would do everything which Italy can do. But those reforms have been pursued very vigorously by Premier DeGasperi very well. He still has the problem, the economic problem, and that problem, of course, is contributed to largely by overpopulation and by a lot of other considerations that worry us, and which will worry you gentlemen, too, and that is tariffs and things of that sort. He still does not have, because of the rather slow return of economy in certain other countries, the outlet for seasonal labor that Italy has always had. As you know, thousands of Italians used to pick the grape crop in areas of France and places like that. Just as I said before, any move in the direction of assisting a friendly and a democratic government to solve its internal problems, not only encourages it but has a very profound effect upon its electorate, the people going to the poll to vote. If we say America is going to take 75,000 Italians, all right. America is supporting DeGasperi.

Senator WATKINS. This is only a part of an international program; is it not?

Mr. SMITH. Only a part; yes.

Senator WATKINS. The United States is in the position to get the collaboration of other nations where they do have room?

Mr. SMITH. Indeed, sir. And I might say that over a considerable period of time in connection with this Italian problem, which is, as I said, the problem of handling an accumulated backlog which the country, despite its consistent efforts, cannot manage alone, that we have been urging other friendly countries to help in the situation. From 1946 to 1951, about 750,000 Italians have been received by our associated nations. About a half million have gone overseas and the remainder have been resettled in Europe. The adoption of S. 1917

would provide further encouragement for others to increase their efforts. These programs need a shot in the arm. I have heard it said that this is a gesture, but as I said before it is an important gesture and a gesture that will be followed.

Senator WATKINS. I think we call it a gesture because we cannot hope by this to do very much about an 80 million excess population throughout Europe.

Senator BUTLER. And we will not need a shot in the arm a year from now to the point of having another bill like this.

Senator WATKINS. This bill runs over 2 years, Senator.

Senator BUTLER. A year after the expiration of this bill, we do not want another shot in the arm.

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; I don't think we can afford it. These shots are expensive.

Our direct contribution under this program, of course, is to admit 75,000 Italians from Italy and Trieste over a 2-year period. The bill under discussion would also provide for the admittance, during the next 2 years, of 20,000 from the Netherlands, a country badly devastated by the war and already seriously overcrowded. The desirable level of emigration from that country would be about 60,000 annually.

Senator WATKINS. What is our present take of people from the Netherlands?

Mr. WARREN. Emigration is around 35,000 to 38,000 a year. They are trying to get it up to 60,000 to 64,000.

Senator WATKINS. Do they use all of the quota allotted to them?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. There is one case I know about. You have about a 4-year wait before you get up toward the top of the list.

Senator BUTLER. Would any priority be given to a worthy person on that priority list under this bill, or would they be purely escapees or refugees?

Mr. HOROWITZ. These are nationals.

Senator BUTLER. This is just to alleviate the backlog.

Mr. SMITH. That backlog, there you have another peculiar case like the one in Italy, which is the result of the wave of nationalism and desire for independence that has been sweeping over the world and one which we, perforce, have touched, because we have felt it ourselves. The Indonesian independence closed the traditional outlet for Dutch migration. That was their colony and absorbed their migration. Now it does not. In addition, a great many Dutch families, thousands of them who have been settled in that area for generations now go back to Holland, to the mother country.

Senator BUTLER. That is a little disquieting, because there keeps creeping into this conversation all the time these little things which will make necessary another shot in the arm.

Mr. SMITH. No, that is done. The process may well reverse itself, Senator Butler. I heard a surprising thing the other day. There are more British businessmen and more Englishmen in business in India now than there were when India was a direct and dependent part of the British Empire. The thing went through a phase of dislike and opposition and now the trend is reversing itself. It is entirely possible that if we get any kind of a decent settlement in Indonesia, with the Communists held back or suppressed or neutralized, because that is a rich area, there will again be the desire for resumption of business. Naturally, having known the Dutch and known methods and known

the language, they will turn to the Dutch again so the trend is very likely to be reversed, as it has been in India. Of course you know that in the Netherlands also last winter's flood disaster dramatized the pressing overpopulation. About 50,000 emigrated primarily to Canada and to Australia. The openings provided in the United States for 20,000 immigrants in the next 2 years would not only be regarded as a friendly gesture but would do much to strengthen the economy of one of our staunchest and most dependable allies, and I may say who most resemble us.

Greek efforts to contribute effectively to our western defense against communism and to maintain decent living standards could be defeated by the crushing weight of surplus population. Each year Greece has six times as many new workers entering the labor market as Belgium and Sweden which have populations of comparable size. Lack of resources and of arable land, war devastation, and Communist guerrilla activity, have gravely heightened the population problem. Emigration to Canada and Australia is beginning to help. The admission into the United States of an additional 20,000 Greeks would considerably ease the burden on the local economy and strengthen the bonds between this country and Greece which stands so courageously on the easternmost flank of our defenses.

Mr. Chairman, I want to again thoroughly agree with the statement you made when you introduced S. 1917. You said, "The bill now being introduced is a good, honest piece of proposed legislation, carefully drawn to protect the United States, and it is drawn in such a way as to make clear what it is intended to be."

Senator WATKINS. Does that complete your statement?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir, except for a brief summary.

In summary, may I say again that the problems dealt with in the President's letter and in the proposed legislation are most critical. They concern friendly countries confronted by acute population pressures and burdened with an increasing influx of escapees from communism. These countries have made magnificent efforts to absorb as many people as possible. The United States and other countries of the free world have supplemented these efforts by taking steps to assist in alleviating the problems. The program provided by S. 1917 would be our most effective contribution. Moreover, our example in adopting this legislation would encourage other countries to increase their efforts and enlarge their programs. Altogether we would be strengthening the internal soundness of our NATO allies and our friends in Europe, as we continue in our common efforts to create effective defenses against threats of external military aggression. And, finally, gentlemen, the adoption of this legislation would offer hope of a life in freedom to many who risked their lives to flee from Communist tyranny in search of liberty.

Senator WATKINS. It is possible we will want you for further questioning. We understand Mr. Durkin is here, the Secretary of Labor, and he has an appointment coming up very soon. I have a number of questions I would like to ask you, but we can recall you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. We greatly appreciate your statement.

Secretary Durkin, do you want to proceed? Will you kindly introduce your associate?

**STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN P. DURKIN, SECRETARY OF LABOR,
ACCOMPANIED BY JETER RAY, ASSOCIATE SOLICITOR, AND
ROBERT C. GOODWIN, DIRECTOR, EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

Secretary DURKIN. My associates are Jeter S. Ray, Associate Solicitor, and Robert C. Goodwin, Director of Employment Security.

I am Martin P. Durkin, Secretary of Labor, residing in Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you concerning the problem which the mounting thousands of refugees, escapees, and others in free Europe poses for us. The President on April 22, 1953, addressed a letter to the President of the Senate requesting the enactment of emergency immigration legislation. Permit me to say that I am gratified by the nature of the response that was so quickly forthcoming in the Congress. Your able chairman, Senator Watkins, introduced S. 1917, with the cosponsorship of a number of other distinguished Senators. I am impressed by the splendid statement made by Senator Watkins in introducing this measure.

I give my unreserved and wholehearted endorsement to the basic purposes of this special program and the techniques proposed for their accomplishment. This bill would, in my opinion, present a sound basis for the legislation requested by the President.

On May 22, I appeared before the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization on this same matter. As I stated to the House subcommittee, there is one rather unusual feature in this program. Most of us find that, ordinarily, in both personal and national affairs, the appraisal of a proposed course of action means balancing the advantages against the disadvantages. In this case, however, I am unable to find any real disadvantages in the bill or any real threat to the interests of our people at home, in whatever walk of life. Its enactment would, I believe, prove mutually profitable to us and our friends in the free nations across the Atlantic, without at the same time calling for any sacrifice on our part. There are certainly enough other occasions when action which our judgment prompts us to take is both painful and costly. Fortunately, however, that is not the case here. Opportunities of this kind should not be passed over.

There is one point I should like to review briefly. If the Congress authorizes the admission of 240,000 special-quota Europeans over a period of 2 years, under the safeguards provided in this bill, would the job security of American citizens in the factory or on the farm be prejudiced? The answer is an emphatic "No."

Take first the situation in industry. Our economy has shown an ability to adjust itself through the postwar years which has surprised and disappointed our enemies. We hardly need the statistician to tell us that both our population and the standard of living which it enjoys are at an all-time high.

It is useful, however, to pinpoint this fact: The admission of 120,000 immigrants per year would mean an estimated addition of 60,000 persons to our total labor force. This smaller figure is due to the fact that at least half of those who will enter will be wives and dependents of working wage earners. The labor force now consists of over 66

million persons, and is being increased by about 800,000 each year. Unemployment is also at an all-time low in relation to population and work force. In other words, we could anticipate from this limited program an added trickle of actually less than one-tenth of 1 percent into the massive pipeline of workers that man our industrial and agricultural enterprises.

We might even narrow the focus for a moment to the critical manpower needs of national security. Defense employment now stands at 6 million—8 times what it was when American fighting forces first saw combat in Korea. Consider 60,000 workers a year alongside of this figure or in relation to the soaring demands that would be imposed by full mobilization, if that comes.

This brief analysis of the effect of this program upon our national labor force is reflected in the reaction of the major labor organizations in this country. They would naturally be highly sensitive to any possible impairment of the employment security of American workers. Yet organized labor has joined in support of special programs of the kind embodied in the emergency legislation now being considered by the committee. It is familiar fact to you and a reassuring one to me, that both the A. F. of L. and the CIO have on a number of occasions gone on record to this effect.

So far as agriculture is concerned, there are simply not enough farmhands available to meet our needs. This is the situation in spite of the accelerated tempo of recruiting activities by the United States Employment Service. To mention one factor, industry and the Armed Forces continue to siphon off substantial numbers of male farm laborers. Several agricultural sections of the country suffered labor shortages last year and this is expected again. Employers need various kinds of help including trained dairy hands, animal ranch hands, general farmhands, and farm couples. The bill before you would give preference to farm workers among others. There is every reason to welcome whatever help it may provide in the difficult task of overcoming the shortage of these workers.

The critical shortages of certain skills in industry also stand to be alleviated in some measure by the entry of the trained persons who will be accorded preference. Today, the country urgently needs more than 6,000 machine operators, 4,000 professional engineers, 2,000 machinists, and an equal number of tool and die makers, to cite just a few examples. There are many other classifications on the list of occupations in short supply.

Senator WATKINS. May I interrupt you for a question, sir?

That is with respect to what our needs may be in the event we have a truce in Korea and the Communist nations will turn around, and we will work in the direction of peace? Have you taken that into consideration in making your judgment on our needs for help here?

Secretary DURKIN. Not completely. I think we will have to still maintain our defense operations, that is, the manufacturing of goods and materials needed for defense, even though there is a settlement in Korea.

Senator WATKINS. A complete turnaround, of course, by the Communists is hardly expected. It is something greatly desired.

Secretary DURKIN. It is desired, but I don't anticipate that they will turn around and work for peace that will be lasting.

Senator WATKINS. I wondered if you had given any consideration to the possibility of peace and what effect it would have on our economy, and particularly the employment in industry.

Secretary DURKIN. In 1947 we came through all right. We had to then cut back when we thought war was over. Our economy was all right. Under this bill, we will not bring people into this country unless there are jobs available for them, whether it be on the farm or in industry.

Senator WATKINS. Even though the bill authorizes 240,000 to come, if we cannot find work for them and they cannot get sponsors, the bill provides, then, that they just do not come?

Secretary DURKIN. That is correct. And they are not to replace any American workers.

Senator HENDRICKSON. Mr. Secretary, do you think these farm workers we take in will stay on the farms?

Secretary DURKIN. I do, and I will give you my reasons for that later.

Senator WATKINS. We would appreciate that, because we have had a report from one of the States here that they placed a lot of these displaced persons on farms. They stayed there for several months. Then at one time some visitor who spoke their language traveled around over the State rather extensively and within 2 or 3 weeks they had all disappeared. Nobody seemed to know where they had gone, but they were not on the farms in this farm State. That is one of the richest farming States in the Union.

Secretary DURKIN. So much for the facts about our national employment picture and how it might be affected by the proposed program. If Congress decides that it should be carried out, you have this assurance. The staff of my Department is prepared to assume its proper role alongside other interested agencies of the Government, in insuring the most effective administration possible of the statute. A good many lessons have been learned from the operations of the displaced persons program which was terminated last year. This is all to the good.

For example, in the employment field the program being considered by the committee gives preference to farm workers and to others who possess services or skills needed in the United States. The Department of Labor, which coordinates our Federal-State system of public employment services, would be instrumental in certifying these needs. Also, the program contemplates occupational screening of immigrants by officials of the United States. This is in the best interests not only of those admitted under the program but also in the best interests of the United States.

It was only in the latter stages of the displaced persons program that trained interviewers recruited from the Federal and State Employment Service were sent to Europe to work with the voluntary agencies to help match the candidates against the job assurances that were outstanding. I might add that county farm agents, who spoke the native tongue of the refugees they interviewed, made an invaluable contribution.

We know, too, that many of the persons who were resettled here under the displaced persons program did not stay on the job because of lack of proper selection and this was later recognized by the voluntary agencies which participated in the program. I have con-

fidence in the mechanism provided by this proposed program. It would make use at the outset of an employment service which is geared to the requirements of American industry and agriculture. I believe that this approach holds great promise with respect to the screening and selection of the prospective immigrants who are not being sponsored by relatives. Employer job assurances developed on this side of the ocean on the basis of particular skills required in particular places would go to our personnel on the other side who have the know-how in this specialized work. We may expect that these job orders will then be realistically matched with the worker who meets the specifications.

I hope that what I have said provides assurances that American interests need not and will not suffer. I am inclined to go further, however, in the belief that we may anticipate some very real dividends from the skillful execution of this program. Our present experience indicates that we may expect to attract some skilled workers and persons with much-needed scientific and technical abilities. And we benefit also from the unskilled who perform useful and needed tasks in industry and agriculture. Furthermore, these people will, I am sure, contribute to the betterment of America as useful and industrious wage earners, as consumers, as taxpayers, and eventually as citizens of our country.

Finally, it is important to note that this program contains safeguards to protect our own citizens from outside pressures on employment and housing, and against any drain on public charities; it maintains our health and moral standards; it guards against the infiltration of subversives; and it seeks, through good planning, to insure that the immigrant is well received. But beyond all this, I personally share the serious conviction apparent in the President's message. It is in keeping with our tradition to give some modest measure of hope to the victims of tyranny. At the same time the program presents a sensible and economical way of relieving some of the population pressures on friendly governments. That which saps the vitality of Germany, Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, and other European nations important to our defensive posture, may ultimately affect our own.

Senator WATKINS. Do you gentlemen have questions?

Senator HENDRICKSON. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very fine and enlightening statement. Mr. Secretary, this certainly should be of value to the committee in its thinking in proceeding in this program.

Senator WATKINS. May I say that I think it will be very helpful to us to have a statement from the man who knows the labor situation in the United States, who is connected with one of our large unions, and who knows about what the labor market will absorb. I appreciate the constructive position that was taken, that we must know that these people are going to be skilled people before we bring them here, and that we will get real farmers if we bring in agricultural people.

Secretary DURKIN. That we will assure. We will make every effort to cooperate with the other agencies. There will be no immigrants brought to this country unless there is a place for them. They are not to replace American workers. We will carry out the intent of the statute if you make it into law.

Senator WATKINS. As I understand the bill, you will have some responsibility, if this bill should go into effect this year, in making

some determinations as to whether or not labor is needed and can be used.

Secretary DURKIN. After the voluntary agencies make contacts with employers to obtain employment, then through the State Employment Service they will find out what are the requirements, what are the needs, the salaries, the working conditions, and so forth. Then we will make a determination as to whether or not they are available in the area or whether we can get labor within the country before we send the order across the seas to fit the person to the specifications. There will be a screening by the employment service of the foreign country, and then rescreened by our people before they are sent here.

Senator WATKINS. I would like to call to your attention a special situation that has existed in the West. There has been a great need for farm labor, seasonal farm labor, in many sections of the intermountain area, where they grow sugar beets and fruit. Of course, in California it has been the same thing as well as in the South, where they have needed a lot of seasonal hands. We have had to enter into agreements with Mexico which were authorized by congressional action, through which we would bring over Mexican nationals to aid with the work. As I recall, some of the labor leaders and others objected seriously to this program of bringing in this much-needed help. They claimed that with the help they had here, all the farmers needed to do was to raise the wages and they would get all the help they would need. Of course, I am a farmer myself, and we employ considerable labor. I know if we had to raise the wages over and above what they are at the present time, most of the farmers would have to quit business. We just could not get labor if that was the price we had to pay. Of course, the bringing in of the Mexican labor is a very expensive proposition. If under this program we can bring over some real farmers from Germany, from Holland, and from Italy and Austria and Greece, then we could seriously affect, for the better, the labor problems we have in many of the Western States and in the Southeastern States. I measure attitude, and I hope your attitude is going to be followed by labor leaders who in the past, to some extent, have opposed bringing in even the Mexican nationals to relieve our very difficult situation out West.

Secretary DURKIN. I want to make this statement in keeping with your remarks: The Mexican labor that is coming in is for seasonal operations. We don't believe that this program calls for that type of a worker because we don't want him to work during the season and then go on charity after he is finished. The idea is to try to get him in employment on the farms where he would be steadily employed.

Senator WATKINS. That is, of course, the hope. Many of these farms would take permanent laborers, but the Mexicans haven't wanted to stay—that is, to bring their families—and they have not been people who could readily adapt themselves to staying under some of the conditions we have in the Western States. But there is room in our country now for many thousands of farm laborers who can be on a permanent basis in those States and that would help cut down the need for seasonal labor.

Secretary DURKIN. We have estimated around 200,000 would be needed on the farms.

Senator WATKINS. That can be placed. That is your estimate?

Secretary DURKIN. Yes.

Senator HENDRICKSON. Out of the whole total?

Secretary DURKIN. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. With that 200,000, we will have 40,000 to place elsewhere. So industry will not be crowded if we can place in agriculture the number you mentioned.

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. We appreciate your fine statement.

The next witness will be Mr. Argyle R. Mackey, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice.

For the record, give us your name and official position.

STATEMENT OF ARGYLE R. MACKEY, COMMISSIONER, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED BY L. PAUL WININGS, GENERAL COUNSEL, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. MACKEY. Argyle R. Mackey, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. I am accompanied by L. Paul Winings, General Counsel for the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. MACKEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is my privilege to appear before you today as the representative of the Department of Justice in support of President Eisenhower's emergency immigration program. The bill S. 1917 now being considered by this committee spells out the legislative authority for that program. The President has called to the attention of the Congress the plight of the many thousands of refugees, escapees, and homeless unfortunates in Europe. He has pointed to the excessive burdens imposed on the free nations of Europe in attempting to deal with this constantly increasing army of uprooted human beings and in seeking to solve problems of overpopulation resulting in large measure from World War II. He has urged the enactment of legislation, within the framework of the immigration laws, to admit to the United States 240,000 additional immigrants during the next 2 years. I hope, therefore, that this bill will speedily be translated into law.

During our generation the American people have been thrust into a position of leadership among the free peoples of the world. We have become increasingly alert to the responsibilities which go with leadership and power. Most of us have come to realize that the interests of the United States cannot be measured solely by occurrences within our national boundaries, and that conditions in countries beyond the seas may have a direct bearing on the security and welfare of our Nation. We have responded magnificently in the past to many calls for assistance. And I am confident that we will not turn our backs on needs which prompt the present proposals.

One byproduct of the upheavals in our disturbed era has been the spectacle of vast numbers of distressed human beings who have been uprooted and destituted by the ideological and military conflicts of our time. In the wake of the fighting in World War II hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons remained under the shelter of the victorious allies. The care and resettlement of these homeless unfortunates was a problem that had to be solved. And the

people of the United States met this challenge. In concert with the other free nations we organized the International Refugee Organization and participated actively in its operations. As a direct contribution to the solution of this problem we opened our gates to 400,000 displaced persons who were welcomed by the people of the United States over a 4-year period. Both of these enterprises are now successfully concluded. It is my conviction that these are bright chapters in our Nation's history.

The legislation you are considering addresses somewhat different problems. To some extent these difficulties may be attributed to dislocations resulting from World War II. In larger measure, however, they have emerged from the postwar advance of the Communist terror. These obviously are areas in which the United States has a vital concern.

One of the most urgent problems with which the President's emergency program copes is that of the so-called escapees. In the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain there are millions of men and women who hate the totalitarian oppressors. Some of them only recently have awakened to the bitter realities of life in a slave state. Others have always rejected the false doctrines but have been silenced by superior force. It is important for us to keep alive the flame of hope in the hearts of our friends behind the Iron Curtain.

The misery and oppression of life under communism have given rise to a movement of escape. Thousands have fled and are fleeing across the frontier into the free world. They have risked their lives in evading the border guards and have abandoned their homes, their possessions, and their friends. These determined pilgrims have experienced at first hand the Communist way of life and want no more of it. In this epic flight to the West the escapees have sought to find the freedom denied them under communism.

The people of the free world have encouraged and welcomed these defections. But the burden has fallen most heavily on those of our friends who are least able to shoulder it. The free nations adjacent to the Iron Curtain have been struggling to solve their own problems of overpopulation and to establish their economies on a solid, self-supporting basis. They can hardly be expected to assume this added load of responsibility. This is a matter that must be dealt with by all the free nations working together.

The second major area of difficulty with which the President's emergency program deals is that of excess populations in some of the countries of Europe. This problem most acutely affects several important members of the European community. Thus, our friends in Italy face an unbalanced population pattern attributable in large measure to the consequences of World War II. I am informed that over 600,000 ethnic Italians have come to Italy from the colonies and other areas lost by Italy in the war.

Senator WATKINS. Would you agree with Under Secretary Smith when he told us that these ethnic Italians you are talking about are really Italian nationals?

Mr. MACKEY. I do, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have evidence to that effect?

Mr. MACKEY. That they are ethnic Italians; yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. And Italian nationals are within the terms of this bill?

Mr. MACKEY. That is my information, sir.

Senator WATKINS. The reason I am asking the question is because it seems to be the primary purpose of this bill to help take care of this expellee and escapee problem.

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. It is said in connection with the Italian situation, that we are not getting refugees, we are just opening the gate to Italians who desire to come, and it does not make any difference whether they are expellees, escapees, but they just come if they are Italians and make application. I would like to think that we are at least trying to take care of these people, the ones who have returned, the ones who need the help, if they need it. It appears they do.

Mr. MACKEY. Those are factors in screening these people for immigration visas.

Senator WATKINS. I know a number of Members of Congress who feel very strongly that the Immigration Act of 1952 takes care of our current immigration problem, and that this act, to be justified at all—I am speaking for them and not necessarily my own opinion—to be justified at all is justified on the theory we are bringing over these people who have been expelled and escaped, or people who have come in from countries as a result of war and increased the burden of the mother country. If we are going to just take anybody, we would meet with considerable opposition in the Senate. But if it is going to be a program of taking these ethnic Italians who have gone out into the colonies, for the most part, and returned, and they have created by that return one of Italy's great problems, we will have a different response, I believe, to this bill.

Mr. MACKEY. I am sure we will.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Mackey, this definition of a national in section 2 (c) does not, either with respect to the persons in Italy or in Greece or in the Netherlands, limit the availability of the benefits granted to people who are in the refugee category; isn't that true?

Mr. MACKEY. It would seem to be so, yes.

Senator BUTLER. Does that mean you can bring them all over? What does that mean, that you can bring them over?

Mr. ARENS. This definition of national we are developing now is broader than the refugee category, so that within Italy or Greece or the Netherlands, persons would be eligible for visas under this language as it is presently drafted who are not in the refugee category.

Senator WATKINS. Did you give an audible answer to Mr. Arens' question?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. This interpretation of the meaning of the word national as it is presently written is correct; is it not?

Mr. MACKEY. I believe it is, sir. A similar situation prevails in the Netherlands, which likewise has been deprived of large colonial possessions. The denial of opportunity to emigrate, coupled with the repatriation of many thousands of Dutch nationals in the colonies, has visited upon the Dutch a burden of population their small country cannot absorb. This condition in the Netherlands has been aggravated by the recent catastrophic floods.

Another phase of the overpopulation picture in Europe is found in Greece, which is still suffering from the devastation visited upon it during World War II and during the Soviet-inspired civil strife that

followed it. With characteristic heroism, the Greek people are striving to conquer adversity, but they are still plagued by the dislocations of war. To our friends in Greece the excess of population over the country's present resources is a source of potential danger which can be removed only if opportunities for emigration are made available.

The final major aspect of the President's emergency program, which obviously is likewise a phase of overpopulation stringencies, relates to the expellees. These are the millions of persons of German ethnic origin who were ejected from the areas conquered by the Soviet armies during World War II. They were dumped upon the war-shattered economy of Western Germany, which has been incapable of assimilating and providing for them.

The escapees, expellees, and excess populations manifestly have created serious problems. Much thought and energy already has been devoted to these problems, and the United States has contributed substantially to the funds and the organizations which have been provided by the joint effort of many nations. But the distressed human beings with whom these programs have dealt need more than a dole, more than the drab existence of a camp. They want and need the opportunity to rebuild useful, productive lives, to sink their roots into a free soil. So long as these destitute people are denied the chance to live in dignity and in a normal pattern of life they represent a potentially explosive force in the lands of our European allies. Their dilemma can be resolved only by opening avenues for migration, which alone can provide a safety valve against the current pressures of dislocated population in Europe.

All of us will agree, I am sure, that the United States cannot and should not itself attempt to resolve the population problems of the world, or even of Europe. Joint action, in which every nation participates, obviously is demanded. But it is clear that the modest dimensions of the President's emergency program do not purport to embark the United States on a single-handed program of coping with these vast dislocations. All that the President's program seeks is the reception by the United States of 240,000 additional immigrants during a 2-year period, 110,000 from Western Germany, 15,000 from other European members of NATO, 75,000 from Italy, 20,000 from Greece, and 20,000 from the Netherlands.

Senator WATKINS. What about the Austrians? Are we going to take people from Austria?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir; it is planned to take people also from Austria under this program, I understand.

Senator WATKINS. And what type of people will be taken from Austria?

Mr. MACKEY. They will be chosen on the basis of the skills and needs in the United States, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HENDRICKSON. They will be mostly German ethnics; will they not?

Mr. MACKEY. Probably so.

Mr. ARENS. They are embraced in category 2 (b), German expellees.

Mr. MACKEY. That is exactly right, German expellees, I understand, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARENS. Senator, the definition would embrace persons who are currently residing in Austria but who were born elsewhere, which

would embrace your expellee category and those persons who were, pursuant to the Potsdam agreement, thrown out of Eastern Europe.

Senator WATKINS. I understand that to be the case, but I got a little different impression from the statements made by other witnesses.

Mr. MACKEY. This is a moderate total but the approval of these formulas will demonstrate to the people of the world that the United States again is willing to assume a position of leadership in extending aid to those who yearn for freedom and enlarged opportunities. And experience has demonstrated that the assumption of such initiative by the United States has encouraged and hastened similar action by other nations. Action by the United States is an important and necessary first step in dealing with the immediate emergency, and like action by other nations assuredly will follow.

By adopting the President's emergency program the United States will once again respond generously to a plea to aid the dispossessed. Such a program is doubtless in keeping with the finest American traditions. But it is well to keep in mind that there is more to the President's emergency program than an appeal for humanitarian aid to our friends in Europe. That doubtless is an important objective. But an equally important aim is to further the interests of the United States and to achieve a number of direct benefits to our Nation.

In the first place, the opportunities for migration made possible by the President's emergency program will be a beacon of hope to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, encouraging them to escape from bondage by offering a chance to live decent, useful lives in the world of freedom. It is undeniably in our interest to encourage such defections and to demonstrate to all peoples the emptiness and brutality of life behind the Iron Curtain. We applaud these escapees today but have nothing to offer them except access to the blind alley of existence without opportunity. Faced with such a prospect of frustration the bright expectations eventually will fade and the stream of flight will dry up. It is important for the free world to keep alive the dream of freedom by demonstrating in action that the escapee can achieve a better life.

Secondly, it is of the utmost importance that the crushing burdens imposed by the escapees, the expellees, and the excess populations be removed from the backs of our friends in Europe who are not equipped to carry the load. This difficulty probably has been most acute in Italy, Western Germany, Greece, and the Netherlands, which are vital in the joint effort to oppose the Communist menace in Europe. It has been a major aim of the policy of the United States to aid in rebuilding the economies of these nations as bulwarks against Communist aggression. It is obviously in our national interest to lift this excessive load which has fallen on these countries and which tends to defeat our efforts to assist them in attaining maximum economic health. By making this comparatively small effort we shall contribute substantially to the solution of a problem that must be solved. We shall be exerting our efforts in areas where they will be most effective in furthering our national interests. And we shall be eliminating potential explosive spots, generated by thousands of homeless and hopeless human beings, that menace the security and stability of our friends in free Europe.

Moreover, it seems to me that America can profit from the reception of these new immigrants. Other witnesses who possess more spe-

cialized knowledge have discussed with you the economic needs and absorptive capacity of the United States. My information is that expert opinion is virtually unanimous in agreeing that the America of today easily can absorb 240,000 new immigrants over a 2-year period. Only last year the United States concluded operations under the displaced persons program which brought 400,000 additional immigrants to the United States over a 4-year span. I am not aware that the reception of these new settlers has had any adverse effects upon the economy or welfare of our Nation. Indeed, the reports that have reached me indicate that the displaced persons are becoming fully integrated into our communities and are making significant contributions to our national life and culture.

It is my belief that our country will be enriched by the skills, the knowledge, and the energy of the immigrants who will come to our shores under the President's emergency program. And it is important to bear in mind that in many instances these are people who have seen the Communist despotism in action, and can testify personally to the emptiness of its false promises. The experience and the information they bring to us can be invaluable in combating the evil of communism. And their zeal in supporting the democratic way of life certainly makes them desirable additions to our society.

It is natural that a program of this character should entail some element of risk. The fact that so many of these prospective immigrants recently have come from behind the Iron Curtain counsels us to proceed cautiously. The Department of Justice is charged with responsibility for administering the immigration laws and for safeguarding the internal security of the United States. The Department of Justice is mindful of the care that must be exercised in administering this program so that the safety and welfare of the United States will not be jeopardized. But you can be assured that all possible vigilance will be exercised to protect the security of the United States while executing the important objectives of the President's emergency program.

The measure you are considering contains ample safeguards, in my opinion, against the admittance of those who are undesirable, unworthy, or dangerous. In the first place, it directs in section 3 that each applicant for entry must qualify for admission under the standards prescribed by the Immigration and Nationality Act and thus invokes the comprehensive protections of that statute. Moreover, section 10 requires that a thorough investigation be conducted regarding the character, history, and eligibility of each applicant for the benefits of the statute. The required investigation will assemble all available intelligence and security data and will minimize any risks. It seems to me that with sound and alert administration the procedures envisaged by this legislation fully protect the interests of the United States. This in my judgment is a factor of the highest importance in your appraisal of the proposals now before you.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I completely and wholeheartedly support President Eisenhower's emergency immigration program. We in the Department of Justice are prepared to do our share in assuring its success. It seems to me that the adoption of this program is of vital importance to ourselves as well as to every participant in the great effort to maintain freedom. Its rejection would be a tragic

misfortune. It cannot fail without withering the hopes of those who repose in us their trust for leadership in this hour of history.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Arens has a few questions.

Mr. ARENS. I would like to ask you one or two questions.

Section 6 (c), the one to which I invite your attention specifically at the moment, sections 6 (a) and (b) provide for certain assurances to be given that the alien to be brought into the country and his family shall not displace someone else from employment and from housing. Now we come to section 6 (c).

I am a little puzzled by the weight which it places on section 6 (b) and (a), because it says neither (a) or (b) of this section shall have applicability if the alien provides satisfactory evidence under the Immigration and Nationality Act that he will not become a public charge, which, I think overlooks two other elements which are embraced in section 6 (a) and 6 (b), namely, housing and employment. What is your reaction?

Mr. WININGS. I think that is a possible interpretation of the act; yes.

Mr. ARENS. That is the only literal interpretation.

Mr. WININGS. I think that is right. In order to rectify the question that you have raised, it might be amended, if it is desirable to maintain the assurances in every case. I think that the provisions of section 5 give the Coordinator the right to prescribe regulations, and so forth, concerning these assurances. Whether it is the committee's desire that he shall, in the exercise of that discretion, require the assurances in each and every case or in certain cases, is a matter for the committee's consideration. But if it is desirable that they be furnished in every case, then I would think that your statement would justify some little change in (c).

Mr. ARENS. Now may I invite your attention to one or two definitions, just to get your reaction on the actual language.

On page 2, line 7, there appears to be a little variance from the accepted definition of fearing to return to a country because of political or religious persecution. Page 2, line 7 says "Refuses to return thereto." The old definitions in displaced persons legislation previously have said, "Cannot return" or "Is unable to return." Is there some significance to this word "refused" as distinguished from the words "cannot return"?

Mr. WININGS. I think the previous language has to be considered in connection with the latter language. For instance, it refers to escapees as persons who have left the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or other Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Europe, including those parts of Germany under military occupation by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and who, because of persecution, or fear of persecution, or on account of race, religion, or political opinion, refuse to return thereto. I think those reasons have to be the very reasons why he would not wish to return. He does not wish to return to physical, religious, or racial persecution.

Mr. ARENS. What difference do you make between the words "refuses to return" and "cannot return"? I cannot understand what precipitated the change on the stock language of displaced persons.

Mr. WININGS. I am sure I cannot answer just what dictated the change, but I think it is merely a matter of expression, because it

says he refuses to return thereto because of these conditions. If you say he cannot return thereto because of these conditions, you have the same result.

Senator WATKINS. As a matter of fact, is it not somewhat the same question we have with the prisoners of war over in Korea, those that refuse to go back? As a matter of fact, many of these escapees, at least the escapees probably could go back. But should they go back if they want to get away from that sort of thing, the expellees, of course, are probably not desirable, and that is why they are expelled. But when it comes to the point of the escapees, they are in a different category.

Mr. WININGS. Yes, sir. Whether one says the person cannot return because of these particular conditions or whether one says he refuses to return, he gets the same result, it seems to me.

Senator WATKINS. Of course the satellite countries probably would be very happy to make it possible for the escapees to get back.

Mr. WININGS. I have no doubt of that, sir.

Senator WATKINS. They probably want them and would do everything they could do to get them. So there would not be any possibility of their returning, it is just a question of whether under the circumstances they ought to return.

Mr. WININGS. I take it the terms of the bill are so couched as to relieve people from the necessity of having to meet that very situation.

Mr. ARENS. Do you regard it as an enlargement of the category or as synonymous?

Mr. WININGS. I interpret it as merely being descriptive of the class of persons to whom this particular term escapee applies.

Mr. ARENS. Now may I invite your attention to (b) on page 2, your German expellee category, and ask you if you have an explanation as to why the element is missing from this definition of the person either having first fled from certain areas, be expelled from the areas, or unable to return to the areas. As I read this language now, the German expellee definition could be applicable to a person who has never fled, who was never expelled, and who could return. I just wondered why any of those three elements are not present in the actual definition as we have had in previous definitions. Do you get my point?

Mr. WININGS. I think I get your point. But I think the manner in which this bill is couched and the proposal which it makes has to be read in connection with (b), and there it speaks of those who are residing in certain areas, which I will not repeat because they are before you in the bill, but who were born elsewhere.

Mr. ARENS. My point is, this could embrace a national who was not either expelled or who has never returned, or who could return. I wonder if that was intended or what?

Mr. WININGS. These are people who have been born elsewhere and who have come into these areas described in the bill, such as the German Federal Republic, the western sector of Berlin, or Austria, and therefore, are in a sense persons who have come from outside those areas into those areas.

Mr. ARENS. Irrespective of whether or not they have been expelled or whether or not they have fled?

Mr. WININGS. I think if they have come there, whether you can say they fled or not they certainly are there. They have come from these

Communism-dominated or Communist countries. It seeks to give relief to them because they are among those who are problem cases. I think that the language is adequate to describe the intent and purpose.

Mr. ARENS. But it is broader than the expellee category, is it not, what we generally refer to?

Mr. WININGS. I take it you are referring to the term expellee as defined in previous legislation?

Mr. ARENS. That is right.

Mr. WININGS. I think it may be broader than in previous legislation, but I think it tends to meet a different problem.

Mr. ARENS. It could embrace people who were neither expelled nor fled from behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. WININGS. I think that is entirely possible, within the definition. It gives its own definition in this particular bill what a German expellee is; yes.

Senator WATKINS. Any other questions?

Mr. ARENS. No, sir. I have only this: I would like to suggest, sir, Mr. Chairman, that the Immigration Service, which I understand helped draft this particular bill, might well provide the committee with a rather detailed breakdown of what is contemplated to be the powers, duties, and functions of the Coordinator. The reason I suggest that is that there is another bill (S. 1766) which is pending before the committee to create the office of Commissioner of Refugees. It might be well if the committee had a little bit further information on just what would be contemplated that the Coordinator would do as distinct from the Commissioner.

Senator WATKINS. I personally think that would be a good thing for you to give us a memo on, at least.

Senator HENDRICKSON. You have a copy of the other bill, do you not?

Mr. WININGS. The other bill?

Senator WATKINS. The one creating the office of Director of Refugees.

Mr. WININGS. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. I have some questions, Mr. Mackey, as to a practical nature. This bill provides that these people who are in these groups may receive financial help in making the trip.

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. In other words, we are authorizing the Coordinator to loan some money. I notice it is not a grant, but it is a loan to these people. Have you ever had any experience in the course of the immigration laws of the country in a similar situation such as this?

Mr. MACKEY. They had that in the displaced persons program, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. How is it working out?

Mr. WININGS. We had nothing to do with it.

Senator WATKINS. Who handled that?

Mr. WININGS. The Displaced Persons Commission handled that phase of it.

Senator WATKINS. If it works, that is fine. But if it does not work, it would seem there should be a provision to require them to repay, if they do not actually get busy to try to repay the costs. Do you know what the estimated cost would be of bringing 240,000 people?

Mr. MACKEY. The estimated cost to our Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service?

Senator WATKINS. No; I mean the travel expense that would be involved in these loans.

Mr. MACKEY. That is a phase of the program with which we would have nothing to do, Mr. Chairman. We would deal purely with the question of admissibility of the immigrant.

Senator WATKINS. You will have to do only with that. But some agency will have to take care of the enforcement of these loan provisions.

Mr. WININGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. The Coordinator would do this according to this bill.

Senator WATKINS. Probably the Coordinator would do it. We may want to get, and I think should have, some light on how these loans work out. Are they being repaid?

Mr. ARENS. I can tell you how they did in the displaced persons program, and I understand it worked with a reasonable degree of satisfaction. The Displaced Persons Commission, pursuant to the displaced persons legislation, allocated certain funds to the voluntary agencies, which in turn took notes from the displaced persons. The voluntary agents themselves stood behind the return of the money to the United States Government. The wastage or loss on it, I understand, was relatively slight, as between the voluntary agencies and displaced persons. Apparently from the language here it is contemplated that a similar arrangement would be set up under the supervision of the Coordinator.

Mr. MACKEY. I think this contemplates just such an arrangement, Mr. Arens.

Mr. ARENS. I would like to ask another question on procedure, if I may. You made an observation there, Mr. Mackey, which impressed me very much as you know, because of our interest in the displaced persons legislation on the actual personnel and control and administrative will on the enforcement of this act, in order to have it be enforced satisfactorily from the standpoint of the interest of this country. I recall quite vividly the statement made in the testimony previously under the displaced persons program by your own overseas operator to one-third, at that time, of people coming into the country under the displaced persons program being estimated by him to be ineligible for admission. Is it contemplated to your knowledge that the Immigration Service would have overseas men from the Service who would be giving a preinspection similar to the preinspection which was evolved in the displaced persons program?

Mr. MACKEY. That will be seriously considered, Mr. Arens. We feel there should be a preexamination overseas. That is my personal opinion, that there should be a preexamination overseas, thus to avoid exclusion at the point of entry, which would require the return to Europe.

Mr. ARENS. Is that the appeal procedure that is talked about here in the act, Mr. Winings, when they say nothing in the act shall suspend appeal procedures, on page 10, the last proviso, "nothing in this section shall remove the right of appeal and review to aliens under the Immigration and Nationality Act." Which review does this contemplate?

Mr. WININGS. First of all, as you know, the process under the Immigration and Nationality Act is for an arriving alien or one seeking admission to be examined. If he is not found clearly and beyond a doubt admissible, he is held for further inquiry by a special inquiry officer. If that officer excludes by his decision, then he has a right to appeal to the Immigration Board of Appeal, acting for the Attorney General. I take it that is the kind of appeal they are talking about.

Mr. ARENS. The point I had is this: Is there in contemplation a system whereby there would be an appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals here in the States from the alien who is or would be then making his appeal, say from Berlin, Germany?

Mr. WININGS. That is the persons we had, as you may remember, in the latter days of the administration of the Displaced Persons Act, which is now, of course, concluded legislation; we had officers abroad who examined the individual as to his admissibility. If not clearly and beyond a doubt admissible, they held him for what was then known under prior law as the Board of Special Inquiry. If the Board of Special Inquiry rejected him there, then there was an appeal from Europe to Washington in those cases.

Mr. ARENS. Will this appeal and the inspection by the Immigration and Naturalization Service overseas, as you contemplated, come prior to the time that the alien would make a formal application for a visa from the American consul, or come afterward?

Mr. MACKAY. It would come afterward, after he presented himself for inspection with possession of an immigration visa.

Mr. ARENS. Let's assume this typical case in which the primary inspector overseas says in effect the alien is ineligible, inadmissible, either pursuant to the act or pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act. The alien himself files an appeal from overseas to the Board of Immigration Appeals back in the States, does he not? Will there be sent back to the States a transcript of the proceedings before the primary inspector, or what will be the mechanics of that?

Mr. MACKAY. Before the special inquiry officer. The special inquiry officer would sit overseas under that arrangement. The primary officer, being in doubt, would hold him for special inquiry. The special inquiry record would come up on appeal. But it is contemplated that there shall be a preexamination, that is in my opinion there should be a preexamination, before this man applies for an immigration visa.

Mr. ARENS. Could I ask one other question? That is, would you be good enough to supply the committee with this information: First what you would contemplate your manpower needs would be in order to have a preinspection, similar to the preinspection arrangement that was worked out at the tail end of the DP program, and secondly, what your costs would be,¹ and thirdly, as detailed an explanation of this appeal procedure as you could contemplate, just in contemplation. I think that would be helpful to the committee, if the chairman please.

Senator WATKINS. As I understand it, Mr. Mackey, all the provisions of the act of 1952 will apply except as this law states otherwise.

Mr. MACKAY. Yes, sir.

¹ See letter from Mr. Mackey, dated June 2, 1953, inserted at end of Mr. Mackey's testimony.

Senator WATKINS. And the entire machinery of the Immigration Service of the Justice Department will be in full operation in connection with this entire program.

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. It will be a little different in the way they would do it, because the inspection and immigration would be overseas rather than here.

Mr. MACKEY. That is right. Well, there would be inspection overseas, and another inspection upon arrival at the port.

Mr. ARENS. But your inspection at the port would be nothing more than a name check.

Mr. MACKEY. Just a perfunctory inspection.

Senator WATKINS. It would be very unwise to permit people to come over and loan money to them if it could be determined beforehand they were ineligible.

Mr. MACKEY. That is correct.

Mr. WININGS. The bill contemplates, I believe, that a large share of the transportation shall be borne by the United States. We should not bring them over here and then reject them. We should try first to so carefully screen them that we have very few rejections on arrival. However, if information should become available which was not available at the time a person was passed upon in Europe, we should reserve the right to reject him at the port of arrival.

Senator WATKINS. That, I understand, would be one of the powers that you would have. In other words, the entire screening and entire operation is to be in the hands of the United States officials. None of it is to be done by any person outside of the official setup of the United States.

Mr. MACKEY. Another thing, Mr. Chairman, is that it is contemplated, I believe, that there are many, many thousands more than 240,000 available. So we will have a large volume of people to choose from. Where there is any doubt, we will resolve that doubt in favor of the United States.

Mr. ARENS. Who is going to make the written report and investigation that the act provides for? That was carried forward from the old DP Act.

Mr. MACKEY. The established intelligence agencies in the foreign field, Mr. Arens.

Mr. ARENS. You know when the DP program was in operation, for a while at least that was not being done by the established intelligence agencies.

Mr. MACKEY. We believe, and at least it is my opinion, that any screening done primarily should be done by established agencies in the foreign field, United States intelligence agencies. Since the Immigration Service will be at the end of the pipeline, like the displaced persons program, we feel that we should evaluate the reports of investigations made by those agencies.

Mr. ARENS. Is it contemplated at all that the coordinator would have any power which would superimpose itself upon the power and duty and authority of the Immigration Service? In other words, the Immigration Service would say this man is ineligible, and the coordinator would say no, let him in anyway. Is there any contemplation of that?

Mr. MACKEY. I certainly hope not.

Mr. ARENS. Who is it that will make the determinations of eligibility under this act as distinguished from eligibilities under the Immigration and Naturalization Act? That is, like your job assurance and housing assurance and farm priorities?

Mr. MACKEY. We have understood that the Coordinator would have that function.

Mr. ARENS. The Coordinator would make the determinations of your transportation, your job, your housing, and I assume on the public charge.

Mr. MACKEY. Anything to do with resettlement of the individual in this country.

Mr. ARENS. But all determinations of eligibility under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the qualitative prerequisites of this act, will be made exclusively by your consul offices abroad and immigration offices abroad.

Mr. MACKEY. That is correct. Ultimately by us.

Senator WATKINS. You are not staffed, as I understand, to take on that particular activity?

Mr. MACKEY. At this time, no, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have a staff that handles anything like that situation?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. You have some overseas right now? You have them in Cuba and Hawaii?

Mr. MACKEY. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. How much more of a staff will you have to have to take care of whatever burdens are laid upon you by this act?

Mr. MACKEY. I would say not more than 50 inspectors.

Senator WATKINS. Not more than 50?

Mr. MACKEY. Not more than 50, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. Have you any estimate, or can you give us an estimate that would be needed by the Coordinator in his force?

Mr. MACKEY. I have no idea; no, sir.

Senator WATKINS. I thought maybe the experience under the displaced persons setup would give you some idea.

Mr. MACKEY. No, sir, I don't know. I wish I could contribute something on that, Mr. Chairman. But I do not know.

Mr. ARENS. Would it be helpful to the Immigration Service in making a determination of security eligibility to have a phrase in here making it clear that the burden of proof to establish eligibility is on the applicant and that doubt should be resolved against the applicant and in favor of the United States in its security? I know that under the immigration law the burden is on the applicant.

Mr. MACKEY. That is the existing law now.

Mr. ARENS. I know it was under the displaced persons program the then existing law. But the doubt soon got to be resolved against the United States in favor of the applicant in many, many cases.

Mr. WININGS. I don't believe we have an objection, but I don't know that is is absolutely necessary.

Senator WATKINS. As I understand it, the immigration law now has a burden of that kind.

Mr. MACKEY. The burden is upon the applicant to establish his admissibility.

Mr. ARENS. In the Displaced Persons Act we said the same thing. But the interpretation was given it that the Displaced Persons Act, nevertheless, superseded the immigration law on that particular point, and the intelligence agencies were required to establish ineligibility, rather than the applicant establishing eligibility.

Senator WATKINS. If there is any possibility of that existing, I think we should check into it carefully, and see that it is written with the burden being on the applicant.

Mr. ARENS. What do you think of it?

Mr. MACKEY. I can't see that it would do any harm.

Mr. ARENS. Do you think it would be helpful?

Mr. MACKEY. I think so.

Senator WATKINS. I can readily understand that if the burden is upon the United States to check all of these people, rather than the burden being on them to prove that they are eligible, there would be an enormous cost and we would take a big risk. We cannot possibly go back into their places of origin, probably, particularly the escapees and expellees, and find out anything about their careers before they became expellees. I understand also all of these laws with reference to criminal conduct, and convictions, and membership in subversive organizations of various types and kinds, all of that in the Immigration Act will apply here.

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MACKEY. No, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Is it contemplated there will be blanket assurances?

Mr. MACKEY. Whether that is contemplated, I don't know, Mr. ARENS. But my personal opinion is that they should not be required.

Mr. ARENS. I don't think you understood me; a blanket assurance as distinguished from an individual assurance.

Mr. MACKEY. A blanket bond assurance, yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. A reputable voluntary agency can come in and say we will give a blanket assurance for 200 or 500 aliens.

Mr. MACKEY. We did that under the displaced persons program and it worked out very well.

Mr. ARENS. It is contemplated that there will be blanket assurances.

Mr. MACKEY. I would recommend it.

Mr. WININGS. I think we should say, however, that this is an area assigned to the Coordinator. Your questions are asking us to anticipate what he will do. We have an idea that something like that will be followed.

Senator WATKINS. In the past, have those blanket assurances worked out?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. And they protected the interests of the United States?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Have these voluntary agencies kept whatever agreement was required on their part?

Mr. MACKEY. They have, sir.

Mr. ARENS. By and large they were satisfactory?

Mr. MACKEY. I don't recall a single instance at the moment.

Senator WATKINS. Is there any standard by which these voluntary organizations are to be graded or judged before they will be accepted in giving them a blanket assurance?

Mr. MACKAY. Our past experience with the agencies.

Senator WATKINS. They are all well known?

Mr. MACKAY. They are all well known, yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. They are established now?

Mr. MACKAY. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. They are not new ones to be created for the purpose of this act?

Mr. MACKAY. I don't know. But the established agencies we found very reliable.

Mr. ARENS. I wonder if you, Mr. Winings, would try your hand at suggesting some amendments here?

Senator WATKINS. I believe the committee will appreciate getting any help we can. I want to say this bill has been drafted as the basis for a discussion. There is nothing sacred about any of its provisions. I certainly expect to give it the closest scrutiny before we ever report it out, to check it and counter-check it, because this is an important matter and we do not want to make any mistakes.

Mr. WININGS. I believe we can say that the objectives of the bill, of course, we support wholeheartedly. The method by which the committee shall determine how the objective shall be reached, we have no particular suggestions to offer.

Senator WATKINS. I am of the opinion that some of the sections have to be tightened up and the powers defined. We had the bill written up and we left it so that we could rewrite those sections to give the committee full opportunity to provide the authority and whatever power is to be given to the Coordinator.

Mr. ARENS. It is your opinion, is it, gentlemen, that the bill, irrespective of other provisions, should have a specification of the power of the Coordinator?

Mr. MACKAY. I think so.

Mr. WININGS. Yes, sir. I think it would remove any possible confusion in the administration of it.

Mr. ARENS. I have just one other question and that is all the questions I will have of you gentlemen. I understand the Visa Office suggested a date line to those who were working on this bill. What is the opinion of you gentlemen on a cutoff dateline, on your general escapee category?

Mr. MACKAY. I am not familiar with that suggestion.

Mr. ARENS. Do you think there should be a cutoff date on your escapee category?

Mr. WININGS. I do not know of any particular reason in a bill of this kind for it. I think that those who have recently come from behind the Iron Curtain may present more difficult cases for determination. And, therefore, operating under the Immigration and Nationality Act, might not be found to be eligible for admission under the bill so readily as one who had been an escapee for some time.

Mr. ARENS. Where would the old 3 (c)'s from the Displaced Persons Act be embraced in this one, people who were Europeans, who had gotten outside of Europe but who had not been firmly resettled?

Mr. WININGS. I don't think they are covered here. This deals with those residing in these countries of Europe.

Mr. ARENS. I understand.

Senator WATKINS. Without a cutoff date, it would be possible, would it not, for a movement of peoples who want to get within the boundaries of this act to begin to move into Germany and Italy?

Mr. WININGS. I am assuming that this bill assumes that there will be a continuation of escapees from now on, and that in fact one of the purposes of the bill is to encourage these people to leave the Iron Curtain countries.

Senator WATKINS. Someone referred me to a story that had been written about certain peoples in the Near East who were moving back since they heard about the proposal of the President, had been moving back to the countries they had fled from to be in a position to be taken under the wings of the act and brought into the United States. A situation of that kind should be considered by the committee, with the possibility that there may be some necessity for at least placing some condition on the time that we are going to take these people.

Mr. ARENS. I have one other question, a technical question, and that is on this question of stepchildren and adopted children. Do you contemplate that the term "stepchild" in this act is identical to the term "stepchild" as used in the Immigration and Nationality Act?

Mr. WININGS. It is not defined here, but the Immigration and Nationality Act speaks of the provision of that act, or all other laws, treaties and so forth. I presume this would be another law. I would be inclined, individually, to interpret the definition of the Immigration and Nationality Act as being applicable here.

Mr. ARENS. How about the adopted children? Would you consider the adoption where the child resides, or over here in the States, or how would that work?

Mr. WININGS. I believe the question is answered by general law, is it not, that generally the child or the res, as it is called, is in the present jurisdiction of the court authorizing the adoption.

Mr. ARENS. Should there be any kind of an operative date on that to make it so it could not be prospective, do you think, on your adoptions or on your step-children? What do you think about that?

Mr. WININGS. Of course, it goes to the very fundamental purpose of the bill, it seems to me, whether you are concerned with those who heretofore have been in a certain category, or whether you are equally concerned with those who may now be within a certain category described in the bill. If the purpose is to relieve, it may or may not be a matter of importance to the purpose of the bill whether you relieve by taking someone who may now be qualified but who was not formerly, or whether you take one who was formerly qualified and continues to be under the terms of the bill. That is a question of policy, it seems to me.

Senator WATKINS. I have another question that was asked on the floor of the Senate the day I introduced the bill, which was this: Will the members of the immigrant's family be counted as a part of the 240,000, or are they in excess of that amount? For instance, I am speaking of the children.

Mr. WININGS. In accordance with our interpretation of this bill, they would.

Senator WATKINS. They would be included and counted as a part of the 240,000?

Mr. WININGS. In other words, they are not in addition to the 240,000.

Senator WATKINS. That is what I wanted to clear up. I was advised by the executive department that that was the intent.

Mr. WININGS. That is our understanding, sir, of the bill.

Senator WATKINS. And counted as a part of the 240,000 authorized by the act?

Mr. ARENS. Haven't you a little trouble on the language on the spouses and children? You say that the principal alien shall give his assurance that he, but not his spouse and children, shall be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment. All he would have to do is to have the female spouse be the principal applicant and then the husband spouse and children would not have to have any assurance at all.

Mr. WININGS. I think that comes out of the experience under the Displaced Persons Act, where it seemed that literally you would have to get an assurance of employment for the 6-month-old infant, or the wife who had a group of children to care for, and you did not expect her to work anyway. The object was to see that the head of the family, be it the mother of the children or the father, would produce evidence.

Mr. ARENS. Should you say head of family? That is the point I had in mind. Should it be the head of the family? You see, the way this language is presently drafted, here is the man, a wife, and two children. The man, if he is the principal applicant, has to give an assurance that he will not displace somebody else, that he will not take somebody else's home. But if the woman is the principal applicant, and she may very well be under the language, no such assurances would have to be given. Isn't that correct? That is under section 6 (a).

Mr. WININGS. I don't know that spouse necessarily means male or female, does it?

Mr. ARENS. That is just the point. A woman can be the principal applicant and avoid all assurances. Such assurances shall state that persons who qualify under section 4 of this act, but not their spouses and children.

Mr. WININGS. That would not logically follow, it seems to me. It seems to me in the hypothetical case which you have cited that if the wife was the principal applicant, then her husband would not have to furnish it.

Mr. ARENS. That is right.

Mr. WININGS. But it does not follow that no one else can be a principal applicant.

Mr. ARENS. Would it not be helpful to say that the head of the household or the head of the family, or something to that effect?

Mr. WININGS. That itself, I think you will agree with immediately is an undefined term. When you speak of head of the household it might turn out to be a 16-year-old boy.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you very much.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you, gentlemen.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington 25, D. C., June 2, 1953.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
(Attention: Mr. Richard Arens.)

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: In response to your request of May 26 when I appeared before your committee, the estimated cost to this Service if S. 1917 is enacted will be approximately \$1 million for the first year. This estimate is based upon preinspection in Germany, Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, Austria, and Trieste, and processing documents and statistics within the United States.

Sincerely,

ABSTLE R. MACKAY,
Commissioner.

Senator WATKINS. We have two witnesses who were scheduled to appear this morning. But I think the committee will recess now and we will put them on immediately after the recess.

A statement on behalf of the Director for Mutual Security has been filed with the committee. The statement is over the signature of Dorothy D. Houghton, Assistant Director for Refugees and Migration. This statement is received and ordered to be a part of the hearing record.

(The letter and statement follow:)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1953.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: As the newly appointed Assistant Director for Refugees and Migration of the Mutual Security Agency, I should like, in Mr. Stassen's absence, to express this Agency's full approval of S. 1917, which so ably carries out the President's recommendation to allow the issuance of 240,000 special-quota visas during the next 2 years.

The reasons for our support are contained in my statement attached hereto, which I request be entered into the record of the hearings on this bill.

Our interests and those of the Department of State in this bill are identical. Their presentation to the committee will therefore adequately report the mutual views of both agencies in support of S. 1917. I have chosen this method of submitting a statement rather than requesting to be heard orally because I am fully aware of the pressure of time upon the subcommittee and thus share with you the desire to avoid duplicating testimony.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY D. HOUGHTON,
Assistant Director for Refugees and Migration.

Attachment.

STATEMENT ON PROPOSED EMERGENCY MIGRATION ACT OF 1953 (S. 1917) BY
DOROTHY D. HOUGHTON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR REFUGEES AND MIGRATION OF
MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Mutual Security Agency supports Senate bill 1917, which implements the President's recommendation to permit the issuance of 240,000 special quota visas during the next 2 years. Not only will S. 1917 make a contribution to our domestic economy by providing us with useful manpower, but at the same time we will be furthering the objectives of our foreign policy by helping to relieve the pressures of overpopulation within western Europe. It is the latter objective that is of special concern to the Mutual Security Agency.

The economic and political effects of too many people living in a country with too few resources are well known. Within the country it means lower living standards and, where no hope exists in the foreseeable future, political unrest. To the individual it means loss of confidence in himself and in his future. To the free world it means the waste of valuable manpower which could otherwise be productively employed.

This situation prevails in certain countries of western Europe, notably Italy, Western Germany, Greece, the Netherlands, and Austria. Although the effects may be strikingly similar, the cause of overpopulation varies widely. In the case of Germany and Austria, overpopulation has resulted from the tremendous influx of refugees from communism during and since the end of the war. Included in the influx are more than 2 million German and non-German escapees who have been made the victims of Communist persecution. Also included are more than 8 million expellees of German national origin who were evicted by Soviet-dominated eastern European countries.

The force of this mass migration into Germany can be compared to 30 million people pouring into the United States within a 6-year period looking for work and housing, with little or no funds of their own. The fact that Germany has been able to integrate 35 percent of its refugees and find partial integration for another 45 percent is a tribute to the resourcefulness and energy of the German people. Despite this impressive record, there still remain over 1 million people, predominately farmworkers, who cannot be readily absorbed in the German economy at this time, and another 30,000 to 50,000 non-German escapees who, lacking the rights of citizens, are at a disadvantage in becoming firmly settled.

In Austria, although the refugee influx has helped to provide needed young vigorous manpower, the very size of the problem has caused difficult problems of integration. Integration is especially difficult again for the non-German escapees, numbering over 40,000, who have been handicapped in finding work and housing, where both are scarce.

The major solution to the refugee problem within Austria and Germany must be sought through their integration within these countries. To this end the Mutual Security Agency (formerly the Economic Cooperation Administration) has assisted in helping to revive and expand the German and Austrian economies. In the process it has been possible for both economies to absorb and put productively to work a large proportion of the refugee population. The fact still remains, however, that a sizeable number of refugees have not yet been firmly resettled. For this group, S. 1917 provides some measure of hope and relief by offering an opportunity for 110,000 of them to emigrate to the United States in the next 2 years.

In addition to the escapees now within Austria and Germany, S. 1917 provides a special quota of 15,000 for those other escapees living within the European continental limits of the member nations of NATO, Turkey, or Trieste. To the men and women who have risked their lives to escape from Communist tyranny, the free world owes an opportunity to find freedom and a brighter future outside the Iron Curtain. Not only for economic but humanitarian reasons, S. 1917 offers these escapees a chance to start life anew within the United States.

In the case of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, the cause of overpopulation has developed not primarily through any outside pressures but because of internal factors and lack of sufficient resources to employ productively all of the labor force. The problem is by no means hopeless. To illustrate with but one example: Italy.

Since the First World War the Italian birthrate has been steadily declining. At the present rate, the Italian labor force will be stabilized within the next 10 or 15 years. However, because of the damming up of normal emigration during the Mussolini era, the return of half a million Italians from the colonies and elsewhere after the war, and an influx of 25,000 escapees, the population pressures within Italy, a country of poorly developed resources, have been intensified.

Again, as in the case of Germany and Austria, the main solution to Italy's overpopulation lies in greater development within Italy. This has been a major objective of the Marshall plan and now the mutual-security program. Encouragingly enough, the increase in the labor force, plus emigration since the end of the war, have been sufficient to offset the postwar increase in the labor force. The size of the backlog, however, still remains.

Migration can, therefore, provide an important supplement to the efforts of the Italian Government to provide more work opportunities for its people within its own economy. Italian emigration has been averaging around 150,000 a year. The special quota of 75,000 which S. 1917 provides in the next 2 years would have a sizable impact on Italian emigration. Sharp reductions in the backlog will lessen the pressure on the Italian economy and make it easier for the Italian Government to cope with the reduced surplus that remains.

The pressure of Italy's backlog on the labor force makes it especially difficult for new young workers to find jobs in the labor market. They are at an

age when they want to get married and start their career. Lack of job opportunities can only provide frustration and create economic and political unrest among them. In a recent survey of the labor force in Italy, the greatest concentration among Italy's unemployed was found to be in just this group—those under 19 years of age, seeking their first job. Interestingly enough, the educational level proved to be higher amongst the unemployed than the employed, especially in the case of the young people, close to 20 percent of whom were high-school or college graduates. Provision of special-quota visas for 75,000 Italian migrants will bring hope and encouragement particularly to these young people. Equally important, it will put the United States in a position to urge other governments to take additional emergency measures to increase their rate of Italian immigration in order to cut deeply into the backlog.

In Greece the pressures of population in relation to limited resources have resulted in even lower living standards than exist in Italy. The effects of 5 years of fighting in World War II, followed by another 4 years of Communist guerrilla warfare, have created an internal refugee problem, necessitating resettlement for more than 750,000 of its own citizens. In addition, some 40,000 others of Greek and non-Greek origin have sought refuge in Greece from behind the Iron Curtain. As in the case of Italy, the efforts of United States foreign economic aid programs have been to develop the industrial and agricultural capacity of Greece and create the financial stability necessary for an expanding economy. Although some success has been achieved, Greece still remains one of the poorest countries in Europe. Migration for some of these people will help to ease the burden at home and at the same time provide the United States with a new group of energetic useful workers and their families.

The Netherlands supports one of the highest population densities in the world. The loss of Indonesia and the economic dislocations caused by the war have made it difficult for the Netherlands to absorb its increasing population. The Netherlands, therefore, still needs moderate increases in its rate of emigration to help ease its population pressures. The Dutch quota of 20,000 included in this bill will provide an important assist in the right direction.

In summary, the surplus problem in Western Europe poses a basic manpower decision for the United States and our allies in the North Atlantic Community. On the one hand, we can leave unanswered the urgent plea for new migration outlets permitting the population pressures and the psychological frustrations to build up and up in Western Europe, but only at the risk of threatening the economic stability and security structure of our European allies.

On the other hand, the United States can lead the other nations within NATO to make the extra effort needed to expand emigration, relieve the population pressures, and—most important in the case of Italy, Greece, and Germany—strengthen those elements that look for solution to democratic internationalism rather than to the extremes of the left and right.

In one case, large numbers of people will be left in the role of nonproductive and dangerous liabilities to western security and stability; in the other case, they will be enabled to become productive assets in the free world.

The choice is clear. By passing S. 1917 the United States will have made its decision in favor of a stronger, more politically secure North Atlantic Community. For this reason, the Mutual Security Agency strongly urges the passage of S. 1917 at the earliest possible moment.

Senator WATKINS. We will recess now until 1:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The hearing was resumed at 1:30 p. m.)

Senator WATKINS. The subcommittee will resume session.

The next witness on our schedule is Rev. Basil A. Malof, president, Russian Bible Society.

Are you speaking for, or against, the bill?

STATEMENT OF REV. BASIL A. MALOF, PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN BIBLE SOCIETY, INC., BIBLE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Dr. MALOF. For.

Senator WATKINS. For the record, will you kindly state your name, your occupation, and your address?

Dr. MALOF. Rev. Basil A. Malof, president, Russian Bible Society, 1400 New Hampshire Avenue NW.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed.

Dr. MALOF. In the 10 minutes allotted to me, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to give 10 reasons in favor of the new bill of President Eisenhower to admit 240,000 extra people in this country.

First, the United States was established and developed and built up by displaced persons and their descendants. And that means us all. But for these original DP's, there would not be today America the Beautiful, but only waste prairies, red Indians, and buffaloes roaming all about. What was good and beneficial to the United States a hundred and more years ago is good today.

Second, if there should be, like some have said, a few black sheep among the former immigrants, then it is not just or profitable to eliminate the 999 white sheep on account of 1 black sheep. It is not good business.

Third, thousands of the DP's who were admitted 3 years ago by the former bill, H. R. 2910, have proved their salt and value, as I know in my own Bible House of Washington scores of these DP's have lived and proved valuable American citizens.

Fourth, it is not ethical or moral for the rich man to live in luxury while the poor displaced Lazarus lies at our gates.

When the rich man did not take care of the poor Lazarus, you know where he got. He got to hell.

Fifth, many of these DP's in Europe are like the man in Christ's parable who was traveling from ritualistic Jerusalem to communistic Jericho. He fell among the bolshevik bandits. Will the Congress be like the hypocritical Levite or priest, who passed on the other side of the road? No; I believe the Congress will again be the good Samaritan to help the man on the highway.

Sixth, moreover, we should remember, all of us, with President Eisenhower, who believes in God, that God has commanded that we love our neighbors as ourselves.

Seventh, these DP's and refugees will not weaken the United States but will make it stronger and more prosperous.

Eighth, the additional manpower will help to defend America, like in my own case, my own four sons were in the American Army in the last war. One of them is still a captain of the American Air Force, a loyal American patriot.

Ninth, the DP's and these other refugees from Soviet lands behind the iron curtain will help to overcome communism. They have themselves experienced in their souls and bodies the evils of communism, and therefore they can give information, to the end that the Communist influence may be weakened in this country.

As I know from my own experience, as the Washington Daily News reported, a number of refugees, in this picture here, Russian DP's,

are helping the Russian Bible Society in the Bible House of Washington to prepare thousands of Bibles to send to the Russian people, as already they helped me to send last week to the Soviet borderland more than 2,000 Russian Bibles, for the simple reason that the foundation of communism is atheism. Destroy atheism, and there is no communism left. The Bible destroys atheism.

And lastly, if the American Government in any way would refuse to accept these refugees and sufferers from the Iron Curtain countries, then the Statue of Liberty in your harbor on Bedloe's Island should be razed, and that wonderful, memorable, inscription on the Statue of Liberty should be eliminated, which says:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

I trust, and hope, as representing thousands of refugees from Europe, since I myself was tried in the Kremlin in Moscow, sentenced to Siberia, because of my Bible belief and Gospel work, and now I am a happy American citizen, and because of that, I do hope and pray that this committee and the whole Congress will again pass this bill and let these homeless, tempest-tossed people from the Iron Curtain and other countries come to free America.

Senator WATKINS. Any questions?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. Senator Welker.

Senator WELKER. Doctor, I should say to you that I missed the hearings this morning. I had another committee hearing, and I am not informed and may ask very naive questions.

I have noted with interest your profound statement, your very religious statement.

Do you believe, Doctor, that the 240,000 provided for in this bill will be sufficient to relieve those tired and poor people as you have related, from their suffering, or do you believe that this is just an opening wedge, and that we might get more here?

Dr. MALOF. My own conviction is that if these people will be able to come here and prove their value, it would be a recommendation for more to come.

Senator WELKER. In other words, from your testimony, Doctor, we have no assurance that 240,000 would be the limit. You would be in favor of all of those people who are in trouble being permitted to come to our shores?

Dr. MALOF. I wouldn't say to these shores alone; but to be distributed among other democratic countries throughout the world.

Senator WELKER. Well, it is a fact, is it not, that most of these suppressed people desire to come to our shores, in preference to others?

Dr. MALOF. I would rather think so.

Senator WELKER. I am worried, Doctor, with respect to the economic effect of 240,000 or any other number that you and other witnesses might encourage us to bring in. I might say to you that in my State at this time we have a tremendous amount of unemployment, due to the closing of lead and zinc mines and the industries that we have there.

What will these people do when they come here? Keep in mind that I missed this morning's hearings; and no doubt that was covered this morning.

Dr. MALOF. My answer, sir, would be that the example of those who were allowed to come in in the last 3 years is such that there does not seem to be any evidence that they have interfered with the employment in this country. They found work, and all the other people who want to work have been able to find their daily bread.

Senator WELKER. Do you have any idea from your study, Doctor, as to what particular work these displaced persons are able to do? Are they farmers? Are they merchants?

Dr. MALOF. They are mostly, sir, farmers and industrial workers; carpenters, mechanics, people of that type. And they are efficient people. In my own Bible House, the former Italian Embassy, I have 20 or 25 of them now, and they are very efficient people.

Senator WELKER. Out in our country, Doctor, in order to get our farm work done, as the chairman knows, we have to bring laborers from Mexico. I wonder if you have knowledge which would permit us to ascertain whether or not any of these people would come to the Far West and help us in our farm work?

Dr. MALOF. From my experience and knowledge of the European countries and those that have been farmers there, without exaggeration, I would say that one of those from those countries in Europe would easily make up for three of the Mexican workers, by their ability, their efficiency.

Senator WELKER. We had some experience not so many years ago with immigrant workers who came to the West, but they did not seem to like it. They did not stay there long. They worked on the farms for only a short time, and then they went back into the city.

Can you help me with an observation on that?

Dr. MALOF. You mean the last party who came in?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Dr. MALOF. Yes; I know of several cases where unfortunately, the sponsors having received them, they were treated so badly, in several cases, that they simply could not exist. Some of these American farmers tried to take advantage of them. But that is only a very few cases. In other cases they proved good.

Senator WELKER. You would believe, then, that if we should admit the 240,000 immigrants, and they proved worthy and qualified, we should then open the gates for more?

Dr. MALOF. I would rather think so, sir, for very important reasons. After all, there is no country in the world today so prosperous and wonderfully arranged as the United States, and at this time, when thousands of others have lost everything through the Soviet misrule—and I do not have any more faith in Malenkov than in Stalin—when they have lost everything, then, not to try to help them and, by helping them, help the United States, would be very wrong. Because they will prove good people. I think that is the only wise and humane policy.

Senator WELKER. Doctor, who will take care of these people if they are unable to make it?

Dr. MALOF. The sponsors, each one of them. There are no end of people in all churches in America, Protestants and Catholics, who will be happy to help them come along, will find jobs for them and see

that they do not become a burden to this country. There are enough people to take care of those 240,000 in a very few weeks' time.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, going back to the same question, and assuming they failed to make good, is there a chance that they might be a burden upon the taxpayers of this Nation?

Dr. MALOF. Maybe, a few cases; but not very many.

Senator WELKER. I am interested in your statement that they could make the country more prosperous. Could you go into that a little bit more and tell us how they can make the country more prosperous?

Dr. MALOF. For the simple reason that these people who have fled from the Soviet lands, and so on, have learned to work. Many had farms themselves. My present janitor, a Russian man from White Russia, had a farm of his own. I have never had a better janitor than I have now, in my Bible House here. They are efficient, and most of them are not drinking people, and they are sober people. They have suffered. And by their work, they will be of such value to the employers, and every one of them will pay their taxes and help, by this means, in the Government, and then a little of the tax money will go for some of the black sheep, and it will equalize, I think, 10 times over.

Senator WELKER. How did these 240,000 people escape from the Iron Curtain?

Dr. MALOF. In the same way, most of them, they are escaping now from the east zone in Germany. They simply cannot stand the Soviet Government. And wherever the Soviets are it is the same story, Poland and elsewhere. Consequently, they have left everything, simply to get away from the Soviets.

Senator WELKER. Well, have the Soviets used any effort to keep them behind the Iron Curtain?

Dr. MALOF. Oh, naturally. They want to keep everybody, and even the war prisoners. That is why they want to get them back, for one simple reason: That they know that every one in Russia practically has suffered, and anyone who comes out of Russia will tell a sad story and bad story about the Soviets. That is why they do not want them to go.

The only reason, if I may interject this, now that there is the fight in Korea, that they want to get all the war prisoners back—and I am sure of one thing, that most of them, if not everybody, will be liquidated, like the Soviets liquidated the Russians who were in Germany and who were sold out, under the Yalta Peace Treaty. They were forced to go back. It was found out by the American zone, and in one occasion I know about it personally, that 40,000 of our most noble Russian warriors, Cossacks, were surrendered by the allies back to the Soviets, their weapons taken away, and every one of them was killed by the Soviets. That is why they do not want to stay there and don't want to go back there.

Senator WELKER. Is it relatively easy to escape from the Iron Curtain, Doctor? That is what I am interested in. It seems to me that our quota here asked for is a tremendous number of human beings to escape from a country that does not desire these people to leave. What I am leading up to is: Could there be a chance, Doctor, that the Soviets quietly turned their backs while these people escaped beyond the Iron Curtain?

Dr. MALOF. No, sir. That has never happened and can never happen so long as Communists are Communists.

As far as these escapees are concerned, every one of them know they take their lives in their hands when they want to cross out of the Soviet land. My own church members have tried to escape, and some of them have been killed. And I do not agree even to that suggestion of some people that the Soviets are sending purposely some of their spies among these refugees. They don't need to do it, because they can get many people across the Mexican border as they want to without passports, and across the Canadian border, if they want to do so. These escapees are, I would say, 90 percent genuine people who will expose communism, which is necessary in this country to be done.

Senator WELKER. Now, what information do you have that you base that statement on?

Dr. MALOF. My constant touch with these escapees, by correspondence, and personally. I meet them all the time. Even priests of the Greek Catholic Church, of the state church formerly. One of them was living in my house. He was a priest, a landed priest. He couldn't stand the Soviet any more. I meet with them continually. I correspond with them continually. And I have the greatest appreciation for their desire not to have anything to do with communism.

Senator WELKER. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. Any other questions?

If not, we thank you very much, Doctor, for your statement.

Dr. MALOF. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Now I will call Mr. Alfred Kohlberg. I understand Mr. Kohlberg is scheduled to catch a plane at a certain time, and we are calling him out of order to accommodate him.

Mr. Kohlberg, will you please state for the record your name, your address, and your occupation?

STATEMENT OF ALFRED KOHLBERG, VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. KOHLBERG. Yes, sir. My name is Alfred Kohlberg. I am vice president of the American China Policy Association, Inc., for which I appear here today.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask you: Are you for or against the present measure before the committee?

Mr. KOHLBERG. Neither; neither for nor against.

I have a brief statement.

Senator WATKINS. Go ahead. We are limiting this discussion, the evidence being taken here, on this particular request of the President for 240,000 new immigrants over and above our present quotas, to the particular bill that is before us, but if your statement bears on it in any way we will accept it.

Mr. KOHLBERG. It is directly on the bill, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Go right ahead. You may sit down if you wish, sir.

Mr. KOHLBERG. Thank you.

Our association takes no position on the merits of the proposed measure, except to say that we are opposed to its limitation of special visas to immigrants originating in Europe.

We are engaged in a worldwide struggle with communism for the minds of men. In this struggle Asia is neither more important than Europe, nor less important. It is equally important.

As President Eisenhower said, we want those Asians who wish to remain free to fight those Asians who wish to enslave them. And we want those Asians who are enslaved to fight those Asians who have enslaved them.

In Korea our sons are fighting beside those Koreans who are setting the example that we wish all Asia to follow.

The American China Policy Association, Inc., therefore proposes that this bill be amended either to assign half of the 240,000 special visas to Asia, or, alternatively, that you assign an additional 240,000 visas to Asia.

We call the attention of the committee to the following reasons for our position:

1. There are more human beings enslaved behind the Iron Curtain in Asia than in Europe.

2. We believe there are more escapees from the Iron Curtain in the free countries and free ports of Asia than in all of free Europe. There are estimated to be over 1 million such escapees now crowded into Hong Kong alone, and other 3 million in South Korea.

3. Communist propaganda in Asia constantly stresses lynchings, Jim Crowism, and the supposed color line in America. Unless this bill is amended to scratch out the color line, it will be used against us in all Asia, and especially in Korea, where Americans fight side by side with Koreans, even in the very same units. Whatever sentiment may be influenced in our favor in Europe will be much more than offset in Asia unless this bill is amended as we propose.

4. In Europe the war is cold. In Asia it is hot. In Korea, in China, in Indochina, in Malaya, in Burma and in the Philippines men are being killed by Communist arms tonight. It is not more important, but it is more urgent that we hold out the hand of friendship to Asia, than that we hold out the hand of friendship to Europe.

5. The platforms of both political parties pledge equal rights and justice to all men, regardless of creed, race, or national origin. Our membership in the U. N. implies the same attitude to all the world. If we are to maintain our leadership in that world body, we must observe our pledges internationally as well as internally.

6. In Asia there is a group especially worthy of our interest. They are the Korean and Chinese POW's who have made crystal clear their refusal to return to communism. They should have top priority for special immigration visas. To bring them over here now would remove what Prime Minister Churchill calls the only stumbling block to peace in Korea.

7. Another special group is composed of native Chinese and Korean Christian ministers and priests who are being exterminated with the utmost cruelty by the Communist Chinese Government. Many have escaped to Hong Kong, South Korea, and elsewhere and should be given special priority.

8. Still another special group consists of Chinese and Koreans educated in America, and now stranded in Hong Kong and South Korea. They may be considered the seed-corn of future friendship with America in China and Korea, when those countries again become free and united.

9. While the number of either 120,000 or 240,000 special visas for all Asia is small, the effect of equal and impartial treatment would have incalculable effects on the minds of all Asians. From our point of view the larger or the smaller number is not as important as the principle of equality.

We propose, Mr. Chairman, that the pending measure be amended to attain our objective.

Senator WATKINS. Any questions?

Senator WELKER. I would like to ask a couple, Mr. Chairman.

I come from a State that is very far away, and that has very few Commies; at least, so we hope. My main interest in this matter is this. I have been informed by reliable sources that there exist in the United States today between 6 and 8 million illegal immigrants who have entered this country illegally. My brief tour of duty on the Internal Security Subcommittee convinces me that many of those people are not here to help our country. In fact, they want to help destroy it.

Could you give me the benefit of your valued observations with respect to the security we might have on anything that has been proposed in this bill, as to whether or not we might get some agents of the Soviet in here under this bill?

Mr. KOHLBERG. Well, I am not sufficiently informed, Senator, to make any observations on that. That is up to our Government, and whatever the security regulations are would apply to Asia as well as to Europe. I have no information on the number of illegal immigrants here or who they are or where they are.

Senator WELKER. I would certainly like to see the gates of our wonderful country opened to all persons, regardless of race, color, or creed. Do you believe that we can generally open our doors to all of the tired, the poor, the oppressed, who seek refuge here?

Mr. KOHLBERG. We are not proposing that.

Senator WELKER. I understand that.

Mr. KOHLBERG. We are proposing only that Asia be treated as Europe is treated.

Senator WELKER. I am digressing a little bit, to get the benefit of your advice on this question. I realize why you are here. You want a fair turn in these special visas. But do you think it is possible that we can open up our gates to allow 240,000 to come in in this way? And it is my opinion that we will be encouraged to admit more as times grow more terrible overseas.

The question in my mind, Mr. Kohlberg, is: How far can we go?

Mr. KOHLBERG. I feel quite incompetent to express an opinion on that.

Senator WELKER. Of course, if we accept your amendment, as proposed, that will not amount to very much, because, as I understand your testimony, you have better than 4 million refugees over there at this time, all desiring admission to this country.

Mr. KOHLBERG. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. It would amount to a very small bean in the bucket with respect to what we could do for the people of Asia.

Mr. KOHLBERG. No, I don't think the whole 4 million would care to come here. I think the great majority would not. But there are particularly special categories who would, and there are others outside those categories who would. I think of it not as to how many would

come, but I believe this. And I might say I was a Europe-firster during the war. I volunteered in the Royal Canadian Air Force before we were in it. But I think since the war we have had a mental attitude of "Europe only," and that is why we are facing disaster in the Far East. That has been the policy, too much the policy, and too much the thinking, of America. We have to open our eyes and our minds to the fact that the world is round, that there are more people in Asia than there are in Europe, and that if we are going to have a free world we must have a free Asia as well as a free Europe. We speak for equality only.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Kohlberg hasn't the McCarran Act had a very salutary effect on the situation in the Far East and the attitude of the Far East toward the United States, because of the change that was brought about in the quota arrangements for those countries?

Mr. KOHLBERG. I would say it has cut down the criticism among those who know. But the fact that the Asiatic countries have been put on the same basis of quotas as European countries is largely unknown there. We haven't made it known. A few know it, but very few do.

I was out in Japan and Hong Kong just last month, in April, and they don't know that. We haven't done a job of telling them about it. The few government officials who know about it feel that they are getting fair treatment on that.

Senator WELKER. So that the record and my mind may be clear, we should not construe your testimony to mean that we should bring in any of our prisoners over here, who want a haven in our country, prisoners that we hold and that are causing all the difficulty in the peace talks?

Mr. KOHLBERG. That is exactly what I do propose, sir, that they should be given a special priority.

Senator WELKER. Do you assume for the moment that the Soviets would agree to anything like that?

Mr. KOHLBERG. I don't see why we have to ask the Soviets about our own immigration acts.

Senator WELKER. But if the peace talks hinge upon that very matter as to where they are going, whether they are going back to behind the Iron Curtain and Soviet control or to some other country, would it not be the last place that the Kremlin would want them to come to, to our freedom here in America?

Mr. KOHLBERG. I think if it would be the last place that the Kremlin would wish them to go, that is a further argument in favor of doing it. And I believe if we were to make this step and open up this country, it would give the United Nations no excuse for sending them back to be executed by the Soviets.

The great trouble that faces the U. N. is that they do not know what to do with them finally. This would give them the answer to that, and I think would settle that problem.

Senator WELKER. I should say to you, Mr. Kohlberg, that I saw a television show the other day. I think it was Mr. Morell's show, where he interviewed some refugees, people who were distressed in Europe; and I heard the statement made not once but several times by the refugees in the television show that they would like to come to America, but they said that the McCarran Immigration Act made it impossible for them to come here. Now, do you have any opinion, Mr. Kohlberg,

as to whether or not, if this bill becomes law, there would then be an attempt to repeal our immigration law as it now exists?

Mr. KOHLBERG. Well, I have never read the McCarran Act, and I know very little about immigration matters. I am not here as an expert on immigration.

I am here to present to you the thought that we should treat Asia on a basis of equality with Europe if we wish to have friends and allies in Asia. That is my whole purpose. I am not competent to comment on the Immigration Act, sir.

Senator WELKER. I should say to you, Mr. Witness, that in view of the testimony of General Van Fleet, I am impressed that the Asians would be hard-working people and would appreciate a sanctuary here in our country. Of course, I am convinced, or the President would not ask for this, that these 240,000 people from Europe would likewise appreciate it. But as far as my own State is concerned, I believe the Asians would be of great assistance to us in our agriculture and in our mining fields out west.

Mr. KOHLBERG. Mr. Welker, I am a Californian. I was a boy in California in the nineties. And you may know, though I think you are younger, that the attitude toward the Chinese out there was one of great hostility.

That has changed completely in California. I get out to my home State at least once or more annually. A great change has come about, and the Chinese are very highly regarded there today.

I have been to your State, but I am not certain of the situation there. I think there would be no trouble with the Chinese and Koreans on our west coast. We know them out there, and now we like them.

Senator WELKER. I might say to you that the Chinese were our original miners in my State. They came there in the gold rush, in the placer mining days, and I can certainly say to you that the Chinese, the Asians generally, are respected in my State.

Mr. KOHLBERG. Yes, sir.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Chairman?

Senator WATKINS. Senator Butler.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Kohlberg, it is nice to see you here. How deeply have you gone into your main thesis, that is, that we should bring in these prisoners of war under immigrant visas?

Mr. KOHLBERG. Well, our association has been actively taking a position on that, as it has on other far-eastern matters, for a year and a half.

Senator BUTLER. Have you gone into the legal status of that?

Mr. KOHLBERG. No; we have not.

Senator BUTLER. Are they not Chinese Nationalists?

Mr. KOHLBERG. No; these are not Chinese Nationalists; the majority of them are North Koreans who were impressed into the service of the North Korean Army, and the minority of them are Chinese who were impressed into the service of the Chinese Communist Army. Now, some of those may have been former Nationalist troops who surrendered.

Senator BUTLER. But would we not lay ourselves open to the claim in Asia that we are putting prisoners of war in slavery by bringing them here, or something of that kind?

Mr. KOHLBERG. We wouldn't bring them here by force. We would merely permit them to apply for visas.

Senator BUTLER. But, of course, the claim would always be made that they were forced to do it. Now, these people are prisoners of war, and are there not legal ways that they must be disposed of under the Geneva Convention and other rules of international law? We cannot just offer them visas, no matter how much we may want to. They are not free nationals. They are captives.

Mr. KOHLBERG. That is correct.

Senator BUTLER. And anything we do to a captive would be construed as coercion, would it not? And while the objective you would try to accomplish is a good one, could you do it legally and so that it would stick?

Mr. KOHLBERG. I am not a lawyer, but I know that our proposal now is to turn these prisoners over to five neutral nations. The UN Security Council will then have to consider the disposition of these men. And if we offer visas for those that can qualify under the act, that gives them a method of settling the matter for those who would wish to come; while if they do not have that, maybe there is no place in the world where they could go except to one of the Communist countries.

Senator BUTLER. And that goes back to the essential ingredient, the consent of the Soviet.

Mr. KOHLBERG. No, the consent of the majority of the General Assembly, for example, not necessarily including the Soviet.

Senator BUTLER. I see your objective, but I think there are a lot of impediments in the way of its accomplishment.

Senator WELKER. Well, I might observe that there are legal impediments in the way of this, too. It is a special act, or we would not be here. It is a bill to take away an impediment by proper legislation.

Senator BUTLER. I am referring to international impediments; not local ones.

Senator WATKINS. You urge this by reason of the fact that these people are now prisoners of the United States, in theory at least?

Mr. KOHLBERG. Yes, sir; they are. But we would not take the prisoners. We would merely offer them the opportunity to apply for these visas.

Mr. ARENS. The millions in Hong Kong are not prisoners. They are escapees.

Mr. KOHLBERG. And the 3 million escapees from North Korea, now in South Korea, are not prisoners.

Senator WATKINS. Would it not be the wise thing to close up the Korean mess and let them stay in their own country?

Mr. KOHLBERG. Yes, but that, you might say, applies to Europe also.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Kohlberg, may I ask you about the movement of these people to Formosa? I am under the impression from what Congressman Judd said the other day in an informal conversation that there is a voluntary organization that is moving these Chinese, or some of them, from Hong Kong over to Formosa. Do you know about that? And could you enlighten the committee on it?

Mr. KOHLBERG. Yes. Dr. Judd is a member of our board of directors, and he is the chairman of that organization called Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals. They are moving a small number to Formosa, Bangkok, and various places where they can find employment for them. That is only the intellectuals, the doctors, lawyers, and so forth, and if they can find funds they will move them.

Mr. ARENS. Who finances that?

Mr. KOHLBERG. It is financed by subscription here in this country.

Mr. ARENS. Is there any of our Government money that helps that at all?

Mr. KOHLBERG. I don't know. There might be, but I would not know about it. I am not on that board. I am not informed.

Mr. ARENS. Dr. Judd, I believe, asked to be heard. I think he is scheduled for some time later on. He probably will be able to tell the committee more about that.

Mr. KOHLBERG. Yes. He would know about it. I don't.

Senator WATKINS. Any further questions?

If not, we thank you for your statement.

Mr. KOHLBERG. Thank you very much, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Is Mr. William Peter here now?

Mr. Racey Jordan, then, is next.

For the purpose of the record, will you state your name?

**STATEMENT OF GEORGE RACEY JORDAN, APPEARING ON BEHALF
OF CAPT. JOHN B. TREVOR, NEW YORK, N. Y.**

Mr. JORDAN. My name is George Racey Jordan. I am representing John B. Trevor, of New York, who is too ill to be here.

Senator WATKINS. You might state who he is.

Mr. JORDAN. He is the organizer and founder of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

Senator WATKINS. Will you give us the names of some of those patriotic societies that are members of that organization?

Mr. JORDAN. Well, there are about 93 patriotic societies, but I do not represent the American coalition, so I would rather not name them.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed. We have a time limit of 10 minutes on these statements. Of course, the witnesses cannot help what the Senators do. At any rate, we want you to confine your main statement within that period.

Mr. JORDAN. Section 1 provides that this act may be cited as the Emergency Migration Act of 1953.

Section 2 defines the terms used in the act, that is to say, (a) Escapee, (b) German expellee, and (c) National.

Section 3 relates to special quota visas; numbers.

Section 3 provides a special quota of 240,000 visas which may be used, as provided by section 4 of this act, during the 2 years beginning 120 days after the enactment of the act. These visas are for allotment to aliens seeking to enter the United States as immigrants and to their spouses and their unmarried children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren accompanying them.

Experience in years gone by demonstrates that the inclusion of the words "adopted children" and "stepchildren" is conducive to fraud and misrepresentation, all penalties embodied in section 12 to the contrary notwithstanding.

The 240,000 immigrants who are the beneficiaries of this act are to be admitted in addition to and regardless of the provisions of the quota system embodied in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, sections 201, 202, 203, but the section provides that no alien shall be issued a visa under this act unless he is otherwise eligible under

the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, except as specifically provided in this act.

Section 4 provides for the allocation of special quota visas:

(1) Not to exceed 110,000 visas to escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(2) Not to exceed 15,000 visas to escapees residing in the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey or in the Free Territory of Trieste who are not nationals of the area in which they reside.

This section also provides that such visas must be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(3) Not to exceed 75,000 visas to nationals of Italy or persons of Italian ethnic origin residing on the date of the enactment of this Act in Italy or the Free Territory of Trieste.

This subsection also provides that such visas must be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

It should be noted in this connection that the beneficiaries of the subsection are not in any sense refugees, and the subsection, therefore, amounts to a complete nullification of the quota allotted to Italy under the Nationality Act. This subdivision is, therefore, in fact, a breach of the fundamental purpose of the Quota Act and is in defiance of the principle that immigration into the United States shall be appointed on the fair basis without discrimination to other nations.

(4) This subsection allots not to exceed 20,000 visas to nationals of Greece or persons of Greek ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in Greece, and it also provides that such visas shall be issued only in Greece.

This subsection also is a clear breach of the fundamental purpose for which the Nationality Act was placed upon the statute books and the principles which were established by law under the Immigration Act of 1924. It is a definitely discriminatory provision.

The same comment may be made in regard to subsection (5) which allots 20,000 visas to nationals of the Netherlands or persons of Dutch ethnic origin residing on the date of the enactment of this act in metropolitan Netherlands. The subsection also embodies the provision that visas shall only be issued in metropolitan Netherlands. Subsection (b) of this section provides that the allotment provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be available for the issuance of immigration visas to spouses and children referred to in section 3 of this act of persons defined in subsection (a) of this section.

Section 5 provides for the appointment under subsection (a) of the Emergency Migration Coordinator, to be referred to as the Coordinator, who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and to receive a rate of compensation not in excess of \$17,500.

Subsection (b) provides that—

the Coordinator may exercise any power, function, or authority conferred upon him by this act through such agencies, officers, or employees of the United States as he shall designate, appoint, or employ, utilizing to the maximum extent practicable the services of existing officers or employees of the United States.

In plain language, Senators, this provision of the act makes, in effect, the Coordinator the superior of the executive officers of the

Bureaus whose employees the Coordinator seeks to utilize. The possibilities of friction are infinite under this subsection, but at least it would seem to guard to some extent against the appointment of the pets of some of the minority groups who have been active in a multitude of ways in subverting in general the provisions providing for restriction on immigration into the United States.

Subsection (c) provides for an allocation of appropriations in accordance with the authority granted hereunder or under authority governing the activities of the agency to which such funds are allocated. This subsection also is going to involve infinite possibilities of friction and irregularity.

(d) This subsection authorizes the Coordinator to prescribe rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(e) This subsection provides that—

the Coordinator shall report to the President and the Congress on the operation of the program established under this act at the end of each of the 2 years of such program. These reports are to include full and complete details respecting the administration of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purpose as provided in section 14 of the act, including the names of persons and organizations to whom loans shall be made and the amount of such loans.

It may be said in this connection that the principal organizations which have been operating in Europe for the purpose of bringing immigrants into the United States have been responsible for most of the evils which arose in connection with the enforcement of the Displaced Persons Act which was put on the statute books under the Truman administration.

Section 6 provides that—

in accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to section 5 (d) of this act, assurances shall be executed by a citizen or citizens of the United States and submitted to the Coordinator. Such assurances shall state that persons who qualify under section 4 of this act but not their spouses and children, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment, and that any such person and his spouse and children who propose to live with him, will not become public charges, and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing.

This section, it may be frankly said, is drawn on the assumption that the age of miracles has not passed. The admission of these immigrants will inevitably bring about the displacement of an American citizen or an alien previously lawfully admitted into the United States from his job, or will fill a job which should be available to soldiers or sailors who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States or to labor which may be dispensed with as a result of curtailments of the national defense program as contemplated in budget reductions sponsored by the administration. The same comment goes for housing.

(b) This subsection requires that the beneficiary who receives a visa under this act—

shall first execute a signed statement under oath or affirmation that he accepts and agrees in good faith to abide by the terms of employment provided for him in the assurance upon which his application for a visa under this act is based.

This clause, while it may be desirable, could result in violation of laws against peonage. In the light of the history of similar provisions in other legislation, it requires a degree of credibility upon the per-

sons familiar with the immigration problem to suppose that the subsection will not be violated wholesale. It is purely and simply window dressing.

The subsection provides that—

upon a finding by the Attorney General that such statement was falsely made, it shall be deemed to be a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States, as provided in section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The enforcement of this provision, it may be also frankly stated, is based on the assumption that the age of miracles also is still with us. The provision respecting deportation raises the question as to where these people who entered fraudulently shall be deported to, and how.

Subsection (c) provides that—

neither subsection (a) nor (b) of this section shall apply if the alien provides satisfactory evidence under the Immigration and Nationality Act that he will not become a public charge.

If this subsection does not give rise to an infinite number of hardship cases such as those which became a notorious scandal during Miss Perkins' administration of the immigration laws of the United States, it will be again a miracle if Congress isn't submerged with appeals for special legislation to nullify this provision.

(d) This subsection nullifies a provision in existing statutes providing for the exclusion of aliens liable to become a public charge who have received assistance to enter the United States.

Section 7 (a) provides that—

the Secretary of State may make such arrangements with foreign governments as are necessary and appropriate for the purpose of financing and insuring the voluntary movement of migrants, such arrangements to be mutually beneficial to the economies of the United States and the countries concerned, as well as to the individual migrants and their families.

From a practical standpoint, this means the United States will pay the bills. The last clause of this provision is obscure because it provides for arrangements between the United States and other governments concerned and should also provide for such cooperation and assistance as may be required in the administration of the program authorized under this act in the territory of the intending immigrant's residence. Inasmuch as this act provides for the issue of visas to enter the United States, it is obvious that this clause needs to be clarified.

Section (b) authorizes the Secretary of State to—

make such arrangements with the Intergovernment Committee for European Migration as are necessary * * * for the purpose of facilitating the transportation of aliens receiving visas under this Act to the port of entry into the United States.

Section 8 provides that—

within the categories established in this section of the act, the determination of eligibility of persons to receive visas and the admissibility of such persons into the United States under this Act shall be made without discrimination in favor of or against race, religion, and national origin of such persons.

This provision is another slap at our existing quota system.

Section 9 exempts immigrants receiving visas under this act from paying fees.

Section 10 provides that—

no alien shall be issued a visa under this act or be admitted into the United States unless there shall first have been a thorough investigation by such agency or agencies of the Government of the United States as may be designated by the President regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under this act. Also, this section provides that any person who shall willfully make a material misrepresentation to any agency of the Government entrusted directly or indirectly with the investigation or enforcement or any other function relating to the implementation of this act for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an alien eligible thereunder shall be excluded from admission into the United States under section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and there is a further provision that no person shall be issued an immigrant visa or be admitted into the United States under this act if the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State or the consular officer or immigrant officer knows or has reason to believe that the alien is subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws or is not eligible under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall remove the right of review and appeal available to aliens under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

No Member of Congress should vote for the passage of this act without a thorough study of the hearings taken in respect to the administration of the Displaced Persons Act under the previous administration. It is suggested that while the section reads well, it is inevitable that a large number of persons will succeed in evading its provisions and that the United States will receive a substantial number of Communist agents, spies, and saboteurs under its provisions.

Section 11 dealing with priorities in the consideration of visa applications is obscure and should be clarified. It reads as follows:

Priorities in the consideration of visa applications under this Act, without priority in time of issuance of visas as between such priorities or as between priority and nonpriority cases under this Act, shall be given to—

- (1) Persons who are farm workers, et cetera.
- (2) Persons who are blood relatives carrying it down to within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to common law.

Sec. 12. (a) No visa shall be issued under this Act to any person who personally advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person or group of persons because of race, religion, or national origin.

(b) Before being issued a visa every alien between 18 years of age or older, authorized to be admitted under this Act, shall take and subscribe an oath or affirmation that he is not and never has been a person specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), or (H) of section 212 (a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except as provided in subparagraph (I) of such section, and shall be liable to prosecution for perjury if such oath or affirmation is willfully false.

Senator WATKINS. Your time has expired, Mr. Jordan.

Senator WELKER. For my part, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some questions.

Mr. JORDAN. I can finish in 2 minutes.

Senator WATKINS. Very well. You may proceed.

Mr. JORDAN (reading):

If any alien not entitled to be issued a visa under this Act and not entitled to be admitted into the United States shall nevertheless gain admission, such alien shall, regardless of the date of his entry, be taken into custody and be deported as provided in section 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

It should be noted in connection with this paragraph that the references to subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), or

(H) are based in part on the illusion that the subversive elements referred to in these subparagraphs will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and that these subparagraphs are based in part possibly on the theory that if they don't tell the truth, it gives something to hang on the undesirable alien if after entry into the United States he happens to get caught. Subparagraph (I) of section 212 of the Nationality Act provides an infinite number of loopholes.

(c) Any person or persons who knowingly violates or conspires to violate any provisions of this Act shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$10,000 or shall be imprisoned not less than two or more than ten years or both.

Section 13 provides that—

except as otherwise provided by this act, all the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be applicable under this Act.

Section 14 provides that—

notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Coordinator is authorized and directed to make loans not to exceed \$10,000,000 in the aggregate, to public or private agencies for the purpose of financing the ocean transportation and the reception and transportation from ports of entry within the United States to the places of their resettlement, of persons receiving immigrant visas under this Act, and who lack resources to finance the expenses involved. Such loans, which shall mature not later than June 30, 1960, shall be made under rules and regulations approved by the Coordinator.

Section 15 provides for the authorization for appropriations to the Coordinator of such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

In conclusion, it may be said, with all respect to Senator Watkins, that this bill is substantially for the same purpose as that of the displaced persons legislation passed under the Truman administration. It is in line with the program which has been advocated for a long time by Senator Lehman and Senator Humphrey in the Senate, and Congressman Celler and others representing the left wing of the House of Representatives. It is a bill which nullifies the basic purpose of Congress in the early twenties when they determined to put a stop to the flood of immigrants seeking to enter the United States from Southern and Eastern Europe. The plea that the people who are the beneficiaries of Senator Watkins' bill are refugees is no more than the same pleas which were thrust upon Congress by left-wing and un-American groups in the twenties. At that time it was officially estimated that at least 10 million people were fleeing from oppression and brutality of all kinds in Eastern Europe. That has been a chronic condition but Congress in the twenties determined that the interests of the United States and its people were paramount. The members of Congress at that time were not unmindful of the situation as it existed in Europe in the early twenties after the first World War any more than they are today, but they were deeply conscious of the fact that our political institutions could not stand the continued infiltration of elements from countries in which the whole tradition of life was based on personal and authoritarian government. The displaced persons bill was a misfortune for the United States because it flooded the slums of our big cities which had substantially reduced the density of their population as a result of the Quota Act of 1924. Senator Watkins' bill, with all respect to him, will continue the evil process initiated under the Truman administration and Congress should not

yield to sentimentality for aliens abroad but should put the welfare of the people of the United States first and foremost.

There are vast areas in the British Empire or Commonwealth of Nations and also in the French possessions where white immigrants can thrive and where the density of population is extremely low. If Congress regards the United States as an eleemosynary institution, it could better finance with American money the transportation of refugees to those colonies than further imperil our institutions and standard of living by enacting the Watkins bill. That measure is pernicious and should be defeated.

Senator WATKINS. Any questions?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

What is your profession?

Mr. JORDAN. I happen to be an author at the present moment. I am the officer who testified to the uranium going to the Russians, and I have written a book, and I am lecturing at the present moment. Ordinarily, I am a businessman. I was a businessman before the First World War and before the Second World War, and I volunteered in each war.

I have seen the Russians coming into this country and jumping over fences and going into taxicabs without any visas.

I have seen hundreds of them come into this country.

Senator WATKINS. Have you reported any of those to the immigration authorities?

Mr. JORDAN. I have not only reported them—I have testified before Congress.

Senator WATKINS. To whom did you report?

Mr. JORDAN. The Un-American Activities Committee.

Senator WATKINS. Did you report to the immigration authorities?

Mr. JORDAN. I have testified before the Un-American Activities Committee, and I gave the information to the State Department, the War Department, and Counter-Intelligence.

Senator WATKINS. Do you happen to have copies of those statements you made?

Mr. JORDAN. They were verbal statements. But the record contains the report of the Counter-Intelligence officer who went to Great Falls, investigated the situation, found it was true, and reported to the Adjutant General.

That is all in the hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee.

Senator WATKINS. I am referring to these immigrants.

Mr. JORDAN. That is exactly what I am referring to.

Senator WELKER. I take it that you have conferred with Mr. Trevor before you read this statement?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes; I did.

Senator WELKER. Did you and Mr. Trevor write this statement together, or is it the work of Mr. Trevor?

Mr. JORDAN. It is based on information that came from several sources. Mr. Trevor dictated the statement. I gave him information from several sources, which I gathered. He has been too ill to go out and get it himself.

Senator WELKER. Now, what is the basis for your statement a moment ago that stepsons, adopted sons, and those others permitted

to come in under the catchall clause that you refer to, have engaged in fraud? What is the basis for your statement that that is a fraud?

Mr. JORDAN. Because of the question that is involved as to whether one visa covers a person and their stepchildren and their adopted children, or whether each one of the children comes under a separate visa.

Senator WATKINS. That has been explained fully in the testimony this morning; that each one of the children shall be counted as a part of the 240,000, and not in addition to but as a part of that number.

Mr. JORDAN. I heard the testimony this morning, Senator, and there seemed to be some question in the mind of the Department of Justice as to just how broad that would be. I wondered if the interpretation was definite.

Senator WATKINS. I thought it was. I thought it was very clear cut.

Senator WELKER. Can counsel refer to the bill on that and see if we cannot clarify it? Page 3, I believe it is.

Mr. ARENS. Page 3, at the top of the page.

The issue on that, as I see it, here, from this statement, and from the information which we gathered this morning is not whether or individual visas respectively, but whether or not the alien who is coming not the adopted children or stepchildren will be chargeable to individual visas respectively, but whether or not the alien who is coming would adopt a child or, again, a stepchild, by a fraud, in order to bring the child into the country. That is the issue, apparently, that is being alluded to here.

In other words, Senator Welker and his wife would be in the category of those eligible to come to the United States, and Mr. Brown, who is under 21 years of age, is not eligible. So Senator Welker and his wife, if they were disposed to do so, would adopt this child, or this person under 21 years of age, and bring him in.

I think that is the point that is being alluded to here by Mr. Trevor's statement.

Senator WELKER. And you say that is a fraud. Based upon past experience, the bringing in of an adopted child, a stepchild, et cetera, would be a fraud, for the purposes of this or any other immigration act?

Mr. JORDAN. Senator, I lived 28 months with the Russians—

Senator WELKER. Now, will you answer my question, please? Then we will get to that.

Mr. JORDAN. I know they will get plenty of people through with that loophole, if it is possible. There is no question in my mind, with the deviousness of the Russians, that they will go over this act, and if there is the slightest loophole, they will come through in numbers that we don't anticipate.

Senator WELKER. All right. Assuming that Counsel Arens and his wife desire to come to the United States, and they are misled, and they bring some adopted children: they are perpetrating a fraud upon the Government of the United States. Is that right?

Mr. JORDAN. Especially if we pay their way.

Senator WELKER. And if they are that type of people, do you assume that they would be fine and good citizens here, if they perpetrated fraud over there to get into the United States? What might they do after they came here?

Mr. JORDAN. Well, if we can't screen them here, we certainly can't screen them when we take them over there. I listened to General Bedell Smith talking about how it was going to help the United States to bring in all those people, because they were going to be so screened. I would like to ask him: how about screening his own department? You have plenty of evidence in the McCarran committee about that department.

You cannot even screen them in Washington. How on earth are you going to screen them over there, when you can't get to their villages to ask their friends and relatives about them? A man simply says, "I am afraid to go home because of religious persecution." So we simply accept his statement because there is no way of checking.

I would like to know when we are going to start to fight in this country, when we are going to start to do something about this Socialist maneuvering and zany planning we have been suffering from.

Senator WELKER. I can assure you that at least 3 members of this committee and its counsel have been working as long as 16 hours a day to answer that question for you, sir.

Now, I am impressed, with respect to the loan provisions in this act, that, though I didn't follow you fully, you did have something to say to the effect that they should be granted loans.

Mr. JORDAN. That was an interpretation of the act, Senator.

Senator WELKER. Are there any restrictions in the act as to what they might use that money for, what sort of businesses they might go into?

Mr. JORDAN. I didn't see any.

Senator WELKER. I am also impressed with your statement, Mr. Witness, about the fact that in the event of a violation, a remedy we would have would be to deport them. And I will ask you: Where could you deport them?

Mr. JORDAN. I would like to remind the Senator of Gubitchev, Judy Coplon's accomplice. They would not take him back, and there was no place for us to send him. These people simply, in those cases, have no place to go, excepting Ellis Island. We just keep them there. We have men without countries on Ellis Island right now. No one will take them, and we want to deport them.

Senator WELKER. It is your testimony, then, that they would be a continuous public charge on the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. JORDAN. That is correct.

Senator WATKINS. I would just like to suggest that the only answer to what you are saying, if what you are saying is true, is if we were to have a completely stringent act that would not permit anybody to come in. Because no matter who we permit to come in, somebody might come in through fraud.

Mr. JORDAN. We stand on the McCarran-Walter law. This is a reopening of the act, regardless of what anybody says.

Senator WATKINS. You are entitled to your opinion. But I am warning you that I do not intend to spend more than a few minutes longer on this testimony.

Mr. JORDAN. I am finished. Have you finished with me?

Senator WELKER. Are you warning me that I cannot finish the examination of this witness?

Senator WATKINS. We have a United States Senator here waiting to make his statement, and I would appreciate it if you could defer further questioning of this witness until he has made his statement.

Without objection, you may step aside for the moment, and Senator Saltonstall will be permitted to make his statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Senator SALTONSTALL. I did not mean to shut off Senator Welker.

Senator WATKINS. It is a situation that might go on all afternoon, and I know you are busy with your committees and have other activities.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate very much this brief opportunity to be heard. I had put my views in the form of a letter to your chairman, when I heard that you were holding hearings here, so I came up instead of writing a letter. I will read this, as a brief statement.

Mr. Chairman, when our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Utah, invited me to join him as a cosponsor of legislation designed to carry out President Eisenhower's recommendation of emergency immigration legislation for the special admission of 240,000 immigrants during the next 2 years, I was glad to take that opportunity to manifest my support of the President's recommendation. I should now like to place on record my reasons for believing that the proposed legislation should be approved by your committee.

Today, more than 8 years after the close of the war in Europe, hundreds of thousands of men and women have not yet found permanent homes. Every day the number of the homeless is swelled by individuals who have escaped to freedom from countries beyond the Iron Curtain.

In Italy the population problem has been aggravated by the necessity of absorbing nearly half a million refugees from Trieste and North Africa. In Greece, the strain of providing for displaced persons has been increased by the prolongation after the war of internal conflict with the Communists. In Germany, great numbers of refugees from Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and other countries once under Nazi domination but now beyond the Iron Curtain are trapped between economic hardship where they are and the threat of persecution where they came from.

These people urgently need help. They need the opportunity to undertake new lives in this land of opportunity. We need their energies and skills. America has become strong with the help of people who have come from overseas to join us in building a free society, and these displaced persons can help us to become stronger.

Senate bill 1917 will greatly help to alleviate the situation. It affords, however, only an interim solution to urgent immigration problems, and I hope that it will soon be possible to undertake revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 so as to make possible some relaxation of the quota restrictions now applicable to countries from which immigrants could be admitted under S. 1917. This bill, however, is a long step in the right direction, and I urge the committee to report it favorably with whatever perfecting amendments these hearings indicate to be desirable.

And I again say, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to read that brief statement to you.

Senator WATKINS. Any questions of the Senator?

Mr. ARENS. May I ask just one question?

Senator, you have endorsed in general the principle of the bill, and you are not necessarily committed to particular provisions of the bill?

Senator SALTONSTALL. No. I have a sentence in there saying "with whatever amendments you gentlemen may work out."

I realize there may be some changes that are most desirable.

Mr. ARENS. Has the Senator given thought to any distinction in your own mind as between the refugee category, as distinct from the overpopulation problem, or do you feel that they should be treated together? I know the Senator has had considerable experience in this field.

I might say to the chairman that I had the pleasure of being in the Senator's company in 1947 when he was a member of the Appropriations Committee, and we were over there with the Displaced Persons Committee inspecting the DP camps. I know the Senator has given this very much attention and study.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I appreciate what you say. I hope that I merit just about a quarter of what you say on that.

But I would feel that you could not make it entirely a refugee program. I feel if you open up immigration to these countries where these people come from, my own feeling would be that you could not confine it alone to refugees; that that would not be fair. But I say again that I do not consider myself an authority, and I would take your judgment on it.

I appreciate this. And, Senator Welker, I was listening with a great deal of interest to your questions, and I did not mean to be the cause of interrupting them.

Thank you very much.

RESUMPTION OF TESTIMONY BY RACEY JORDAN

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Jordan, will you please resume the stand? Senator Welker wishes to resume his examination.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Jordan, I do not wish to belabor this matter. I realize we are in a hurry. There are several things I think we should ask you about.

You state on page 8 of your statement that while this section reads well, referring to section 212 (a) of paragraph (19)—

*** it is inevitable that a large number of persons will succeed in evading its provisions and that the United States will receive a substantial number of Communist agents, spies, and saboteurs under its provisions.

Mr. Jordan, if that be true, what would be the remedy under this bill? How can we get rid of it?

Mr. JORDAN. Well, Senator, in every case where you are taking nationals from Italy or Greece or the Netherlands, you have every opportunity to go to their local communities and ask them their previous history; but when you are taking escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, it is their own statement that they are afraid to return for fear of racial persecution of some kind. I can tell you that the Russians will just simply eat that up.

Senator WELKER. I take it, then, that you feel that a Communist does not hesitate to lie under oath or any other way.

Mr. JORDAN. All you have to do is to read the hearings, such as I do, with 6-point type, thousands and thousands of words of hearings, and you have a complete story. You probably have not had the time to read the Un-American Activities Committee hearings and also the hearings of the McCarran committee, but I will tell you they are a complete story of what is happening to our country. The foundations of our liberties are being nicked away, inch by inch, and little chips at a time, and we certainly ought to be given time enough to digest the people that we have here without bringing in 240,000 more to throw a further burden upon our security.

Senator WELKER. Now, can you give the committee or at least give the interrogator any suggestions as to how you will properly screen these people, by going even to Italy or Greece? Will that not take quite a lot of time?

Mr. JORDAN. I think the last percentage of communism in Greece was nearly 40 percent, so that if you take the Communist vote in the last election it will give you a rough idea of the vote in Italy, as far as communism is concerned. And if we are going to take 75,000 nationals—and remember, this is the first time I have ever seen the word "nationals" used in this way, which means that we are going to start taking surplus populations from Europe. And we have never done that before. We have been very careful in the past. And when I listened to the Under Secretary of Agriculture testify that we were going to put them down on the farm, I tell you there is no peonage act in this country that can keep anybody on the farm. They are going to go where people speak their language, where their uncles and cousins are, and they will wind up in the big industrial centers, and on relief, and taking jobs where there is already unemployment, and taking jobs away from our soldiers, who are going to come home from Korea one of these days. And I think somebody has to stand up and speak for those soldiers.

Senator WELKER. Going back to the question, assuming we have an inference that a man has been a member of the Communist Party, or a Fascist, assuming we have that information, is it not going to take quite a lot of administration, and investigators, to go there and find out the truth or falsity of that allegation?

Mr. JORDAN. Senator, I would like to first see an investigation of the investigators, the investigators that have been doing the investigating up to now. There is a great deal to be said about their security.

Senator WELKER. I am not going into that. I am assuming that we have the most competent and able investigators in the country among our FBI agents. Will it or will it not take some time to determine whether or not the subject has been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JORDAN. I don't see how they can prove it.

Senator WELKER. And to close what little I have to say, at the bottom of page 8, your statement says that in section 12 (a):

No visa shall be issued under this act to any person who personally advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person or group of persons because of race, religion, or national origin.

Now, this is probably the same question as before. That will be a difficult thing to establish, will it not?

Mr. JORDAN. Exceedingly difficult, Senator. We are letting ourselves in for a terrific amount of headaches, superimposed on top of what we already have. This, to me, is perfectly silly, to say that you can screen people at the source, and then get them jobs and get them housing and get them all the rest of it over here. I can't understand how people can stand up here with a straight face and tell you gentlemen those things and think you are going to believe it.

Mr. ARENS. Major, have you had any experience in the intelligence field or in the investigating field?

Mr. JORDAN. In the Army, slightly.

Mr. ARENS. What was that?

Mr. JORDAN. When I was checking on lend-lease. I was executive officer at the Newark Airport, in charge of security, checking on lend-lease. We had a very great many difficulties. As a veteran of the First World War, I also was selected because of my background to check on the shipments of materials that went to the Russians.

Senator WELKER. Then my concluding question, Mr. Chairman, is: There is the penalty provision in this act that any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provisions of this act shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than \$500 or more than \$10,000, or shall be imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 10 years. Are you assuming that any of those people if they are convicted would have that kind of money to pay a fine?

Mr. JORDAN. No; I am not.

Senator WELKER. And if they are sent to jail for not less than 2 or more than 10 years, they will be wards of the Government at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Mr. JORDAN. That is correct, sir. That is a very correct analysis.

Senator WELKER. I should say to you, sir, that I have not studied these matters. As I stated a moment ago, I missed the hearing this morning. I want to get all the information I can. I feel I have a duty to perform, and as long as I sit in the Senate I am going to ask questions that I think will enlighten me, because I need that information.

That concludes my examination.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator WATKINS. The next witness will be Mr. Bogumil Vosnjak.

Will you state, for the record, your name, your address, and your occupation?

STATEMENT OF BOGUMIL VOSNJAK, MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY AND FORMER MEMBER OF YUGOSLAV PARLIAMENT

Dr. VOSNJAK. I am Bogumil Vosnjak, of 706 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C. I am a former member of the Yugoslav Parliament, and my status is Minister Plenipotentiary.

Senator WATKINS. Are you an American citizen?

Dr. VOSNJAK. I am a permanent resident of the United States.

Senator WATKINS. What nationality are you?

Dr. VOSNJAK. A Yugoslav.

Senator WATKINS. And you are a citizen or a national of Yugoslavia?

Dr. VOSNJAK. No, I consider myself stateless.

Senator WATKINS. A stateless person. Well, the last place you had any nationality was in Yugoslavia; is that right?

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. You have prepared a written statement?

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes. I can read it.

Senator WATKINS. Can you give us the highlights of it in an oral statement, and then leave some time in your 10 minutes for questioning?

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. You can file the complete statement with the committee. If you would just give the highlights, we would appreciate it.

Dr. VOSNJAK. I think that also the problem of the agricultural immigration ought to be the object of careful study. How the immigrated farmers of Europe and the countries behind the Iron Curtain will settle in the United States, how they will behave as members of a social group, and in what degree they will foster the economic goals of American agriculture, these are all questions which must be discussed. It is not enough to move the immigrant to America, to find him the first job and after that abandon him to his fate. A sound policy demands that the settler has to be carefully watched. The new country has the right and the duty to follow the immigrant in his economic activity. Only under this supposition are the true interests of the country safeguarded.

It is useful to review very shortly the economic background of the immigrated agriculturist. Today the satellite countries which are overwhelmingly the home of the agricultural immigrants are represented by fellow travelers and Communists in a distorted falsified way as victims of reactionary and feudal rulers whose only goal was to exploit the land in the interest of the great landowners. We must mention the ideal country of the peasant, the poor man's paradise, old Serbia, before the First World War. After the downfall of Turkish rule a century and a half ago, no more great landowners existed. Serbia was the first country in Europe to introduce homesteads. After liberation in 1918 the Eastern European states realized a radical agrarian reform which destroyed immediately the consequences of Austro-Hungarian agrarian misrule. The small landowner of Eastern Europe is today the stoutest fighter against communism and eludes its victory.

According to the official census taken before the war, the agricultural population of Bulgaria was 81 percent; of Albania, 80 percent; of Yugoslavia, 76 percent; of Rumania, 76 percent; of Lithuania, 60 percent; of Poland, 50 percent; of Estonia, 53 percent; and 39 percent of Czechoslovakia. We see that with the exception of the last highly industrialized country the satellite countries of today were in 1945 agrarian and therefore it can be assumed that also the emigration has agrarian character. It was the will of the legislators in 1948 that 50 percent of the visas issued were to be made exclusively available to displaced persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural occupation and who would be so employed in the United States.

This preference of agricultural immigrants anticipated an economic situation which arose 3 years later. As the Secretary of Agriculture stated in 1951 were 329,000 fewer farm workers than there had been

in 1950, and 734,000 fewer than in 1949. There is indicated a further decrease of 200,000 to 300,000 under 1951 levels.

To fill this gap the immigration of European agriculturists was welcomed. In the United States arrived since 1948 nearly 400,000 displaced persons. Of these 25.2 percent declared their basic skill was farming. That means nearly 100,000; if we taken in consideration that on the basis of figures given by the Secretary of Agriculture the gap is not 100,000 but nearly 1,300,000, we must come to the conclusion that every measure which will open the door of the United States to the agriculturists who wish to reach freedom and escape the congested agricultural areas of Europe has to be hailed, especially Italy, which is so heavily pressed by a population surplus of most dangerous size. Is not the depletion of the seething agricultural countries of Europe and perhaps also of Asia a formidable weapon in the struggle against communism? These are prospects of appalling importance which will open the door to new colossal activities.

Unfortunately, the efforts to settle European immigrants on the land and to adapt them to the exigencies of American rural life were, until now, not at all successful.

Here it must be stated that the immigrants who came to the United States, farmers, enjoyed a friendly and enthusiastic reception.

Senator WELKER. Where are you reading from now, Mr. Witness? I have lost track.

Dr. VOSNJAK. I am now on page 8.

Senator WELKER. Well, you skipped a part, then, on page 2.

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes; but it is less important.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Dr. VOSNJAK. We must never forget that those who immigrated as agriculturists were in Europe independent farmers, operating their own land, accustomed to being their own masters. It was for them a paradox to be forced into the role of an agricultural worker, a position for them strange and inconceivable. They were accustomed to till their own land.

The former east European farmer has to be settled as an agricultural worker, or he ought to have the chance to operate as a tenant or in the capacity of an independent farmer.

It is the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which gives us a possibility for the solution of the problem. I approached with such a proposal the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, Representative Cooley, who was from the first beginning very favorable for the project that former farmer DP's shall be eligible for loans and assistance on the basis of an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, notwithstanding that these farmers are not yet citizens of the United States. The text of the bill was prepared, and Representative Francis Walter took over the legislative sponsorship of the bill.

The end of the session interrupted the work on this project.

The Farmers' Home Administration does wonderful work, indeed.

There are 40 State offices and 1,700 county offices. They helped more than a million American farm families. The agency's employees are making the loans, handling collections, and providing planning assistance in farm training. Why not include the former DP farmers in such a formative organization? It is the goal of the Bankhead-Jones Act to create family farms, farms which the farmer

and his family are operating. That is just the ideal for which the eastern European farmer is striving.

I must mention that I have been informed by the Canadian Embassy that in Canada loans are available to groups of farmers under the Canadian Farm Improvement Act. Canadian citizenship is not a requirement. The Province of Nova Scotia offers financial assistance for the purchase of improved farms under the government of the Province to a total of \$8,000. Nonresidents of Canada are usually required to obtain 2 years of farm experience in Canada before being assisted. They must declare their intention to become Canadian citizens. We see that Canada already realized the legislative intentions of an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act.

The economy of the United States is asking for a tremendous production of food for the country, as also for the starving nations of the whole world. In such a state of affairs, to help eastern European farmers, now against their will working in overcrowded cities in industry, would be vital and invaluable aid.

Still another point of view must be taken into consideration. The farmer immigrants are fully convinced that they will return into a free state of life. The agriculture of our countries will demand American experience, wisdom, and constructiveness. It is a pity that the farmers of eastern Europe who became industrial workers will not have the chance to use such a wonderful occasion to be acquainted with this world miracle which is American agriculture.

I would hope that American economic and legislative genius will not hesitate, through a wise legislative regulation and efficient administrative proceedings, to return the throngs of eastern European farmers to the destination in which they were trained in the course of centuries; to return to the cultivation and the interest of the United States and their own State will require agriculturists of high qualification who will be the harbingers of American methods of farming, but also of a higher, more dignified way of life.

I was very carefully reading the bill. We from Europe are extremely thankful to Senator Watkins for this bill.

Senator WATKINS. Have you any other statement to make?

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes; I would only mention that it seems to me the best way if in the bill there could be mentioned also the possibility for agriculturists to get loans in the spirit of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Senator WELKER. What is that, again? You say the best thing is for the immigrant to get loans in the spirit of the Bankhead-Jones Act?

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Loans to start them in the farming business?

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes; yes.

Senator WATKINS. It does not provide that. It merely provides for their transportation to get over here.

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes. Nevertheless, there could be some amendment to the bill.

Senator WELKER. You are for this bill, as I understand it?

Dr. VOSNJAK. Naturally. Would you kindly permit me a few words?

Senator WATKINS. We still have many to hear from today. If you have a further statement you have prepared, you can submit it for the record.

Dr. VOSNJAK. I will give it later.

Senator WELKER. I would like to ask two short questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. Go right ahead.

Senator WELKER. You believe that these immigrant farmers, when brought over, should be permitted to own their own land?

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes.

Senator WELKER. How are they going to acquire it? By loan from the Government?

Dr. VOSNJAK. By loan from the Government, like they are getting in Canada. Also, if they are not Canadian citizens, they are able to get Canadian loans.

Senator WELKER. And, of course, these persons, most of them, you say, are farmers that love their land.

Dr. VOSNJAK. Yes.

Senator WELKER. They love to own their land.

Dr. VOSNJAK. They are thoroughly democrats.

Senator WELKER. In the event that they are not permitted to farm by tenant farming or owning their own land, do you suppose they will go out and work on our modern farms now?

Dr. VOSNJAK. I didn't quite understand your question. Excuse me, Senator.

Senator WELKER. It is true that we have a surplus of most farm goods in our Nation today. We are producing more than we can use. We are producing more than we can export. And that, to me at least, adds to the burden of the American taxpayer and is to the detriment of the American farmer. We are already operating under a surplus and subsidies. So what are we going to do if your plan, your advocated plan, comes into effect, and we have these people who do go on to farm and produce more?

Dr. VOSNJAK. I gave you the figures, how manpower on the farms is declining.

Senator WELKER. There is no question about manpower to run a farm declining, but there is a question as to whether or not you can get people to work.

To me it looks like if we bring these people in and set them up on farms, we will really hurt the American farmer. However, that is a question for the committee.

Dr. VOSNJAK. I think that danger doesn't exist.

Senator WATKINS. The bill does not provide for that, and I do not think there is any purpose of the administration to suggest such an idea. If they come over here and are willing to work, they can find employment, but I do not think this Government is going into the business of loaning them money to buy farms and to set them up in the business of farming. If we go far enough to help them get over here and see that they have a job when they get here, that is about all they can expect. If they do not want to come under those circumstances, of course, they had better stay in Europe.

Dr. VOSNJAK. But they are not able to stay in Europe. They are in different concentration camps. Now, for instance, in Italy, I have here a list of many hundreds of people who are staying in camps.

Senator WATKINS. There are a few in Italy in camps, but there are not many as compared to what there used to be in the camps over there.

If you have completed your statement, we will thank you, and we will call our next witness.

Dr. VOSNJAK. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Dr. Weber?

Is Mr. Quinn in the room?

Has Mr. Peter come in in the meantime?

Each of these gentlemen requested time. We have assigned them time ahead of other witnesses.

If they are here, we would be glad to hear from them. Otherwise, we will not have time at the other hearings to take care of them, because the time is scheduled now for several days in advance. We would greatly appreciate it if those who are scheduled would be here promptly, so as to go on the stand when they are called.

Dr. Weber is here now?

Will you state your name and your address?

STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. WEBER, VETERANS' HOSPITAL,
Oteen, N. C.

Dr. WEBER. I am Dr. George W. Weber, veterans' hospital, Oteen, N. C.

Senator WATKINS. And what is your occupation?

Dr. WEBER. Physician.

Senator WATKINS. Practicing in North Carolina?

Dr. WEBER. I am with the Veterans' Administration; chief of section in the hospital.

Senator WATKINS. Are you for, or against, this bill?

Dr. WEBER. I am for the bill, but I think there should be some safeguards. I am not representing anybody. My only qualification for being here is that I was a consultant in Europe to the displaced-persons program 3 years ago, and I think I have some useful information, and perhaps I could answer some questions that were asked this morning, which might help you.

Senator WATKINS. Well, we will be glad to hear from you.

We will give you 10 minutes for your main statement.

Dr. WEBER. Thank you very much.

I am sorry that I don't have any prepared statement, because I walked into this room this morning, quite by accident. I didn't know it was going on.

Senator WATKINS. Have you not applied for time to appear before this committee?

Dr. WEBER. No. I came in this morning, and I applied to the counsel when I saw what it was all about.

Senator WATKINS. I see.

Dr. WEBER. First of all, let me state that I am not against this bill, because I am an immigrant myself, and I think that the increased immigration will be good both for this country and for Europe.

Judging from my personal experience, I think that any honest immigrant is better qualified to appreciate the benefits that he gets here, and I think that he works harder than the average citizen, because he is up against several handicaps, and he has a challenge.

I came here in 1929, as a political refugee from Italy. I was born in Italy of German parentage, and I have had a wonderful opportunity in this country. I have made a wonderful career. So I am for this bill. But on the basis of my experience in Europe, during the time I served there as consultant for the Quarantine Division for the displaced persons program, I feel that some safeguards should be put into the bill so as to avoid the admission of diseased persons, first, and secondly, I think of politically unreliable individuals.

Senator WATKINS. You realize that under the 1952 act there are certain safeguards put in in connection with such matters?

Dr. WEBER. I realize that. But I understood from the discussion this morning that perhaps with this new bill, a new Displaced Persons Commission would be appointed.

Mr. ARENS. Are you a doctor?

Dr. WEBER. I am a physician.

Mr. ARENS. What safeguards do you suggest? I understood you to say you were with the Displaced Persons Commission.

Dr. WEBER. I was sent there as tuberculosis consultant to screen out the tubercular cases among the immigrants.

Mr. ARENS. You feel it did not work too well? Is that it?

Dr. WEBER. It didn't work at all.

Mr. ARENS. What is your concrete suggestion as to what should be done?

Dr. WEBER. That the politics be taken out of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. ARENS. That the what be taken out?

Dr. WEBER. That the politics be taken out, political pressures.

You see, the Displaced Persons Commission was made up of a number of voluntary agencies.

Senator WATKINS. Of what?

Dr. WEBER. Of a number of voluntary agencies. And all of them had their ax to grind, and all of them had certain immigrants to bring in.

Mr. ARENS. Doctor, aren't you mistaken when you say the Displaced Persons Commission was made up of a number of voluntary agencies? Wasn't it made up of three men who were appointed—

Dr. WEBER. Well, it was made up of three men, but the whole Displaced Persons Commission was worked through these voluntary agencies, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish. I don't remember now how many there were. I am telling you that, because I had the experience there. On my account, we brought in, out of a total of 242,000 displaced persons—we brought in under the program upward of 3,000 cases of active tuberculosis.

Mr. ARENS. They have gone into the country?

Dr. WEBER. They have gone into the country.

Mr. ARENS. We would appreciate very much, Doctor, if you could tell this committee how legislation could be drafted to obviate that situation's recurring.

Dr. WEBER. That is a little difficult, but if I could tell you one thing, I would put the I. and N. in charge of the entire program.

Mr. ARENS. Immigration and Naturalization Service?

Dr. WEBER. Yes. That was the only bureau that could stand any political pressure whatsoever, as far as I was concerned, from my experience in Europe.

Senator WATKINS. The Immigration Service?

Dr. WEBER. The Immigration and Naturalization Service. Their representatives in Europe were the only men that could stand political pressure regardless of what came.

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask you this: Do you think these 3,000 cases of tuberculosis were brought in here largely because of political pressures?

Dr. WEBER. Well, I wouldn't say it was political pressure for those individuals. It was the pressure of making up a quota at the end of the month. They had to make up a quota.

Now, if I, as a tuberculosis consultant, disqualified a number of those immigrants because they had tuberculosis, that quota would be shot to pieces. I am not trying to say that the service which I represented in Europe was not trying to screen these people. The tubercular service was trying to do it. But Mr. Rosenfield, who, I understand, was an official of the Federal Security Administration, was the factotum in the Displaced Persons Commission, and I think he could swing power right and left.

The result is that my work in Germany was completely nullified. I had to see these people coming through without being able to do anything.

Mr. ARENS. What you are saying is, is it not, that you, as an official of the Public Health Service, charged with the responsibility of examining people as to eligibility, were under terrific pressure?

Dr. WEBER. I wasn't, because at the end, when I saw that I couldn't do what I should have done, I asked to be recalled.

Mr. ARENS. Who was it that was under pressure?

Dr. WEBER. It was the headquarters in Washington that was under pressure, and that refused to let me do the work I was supposed to do. When I saw that, I said, "All right. You recall me. Because I just cannot do it the way you want it done."

Mr. ARENS. Let me ask you this. Do you think it would help, in any contemplated program, if we did not have deadlines to meet? In other words, assuming that so many people were going to be brought into the country, would it help, in your judgment, if they did not have to bring them in within a certain period of time, so that the administrative officials would have more time to screen them?

Dr. WEBER. I suppose that is true. If there was no deadline, of course, everything could be done more efficiently. But I don't know how you could eliminate the fact that, for instance, the Catholic agency has assurances for about 20 families coming in here. All right. They pick up 20 families in Germany among the DP camps. Those 20 families are screened, and then they are examined, given a physical examination. Out of families of 6 or 8 people, we find 1 case of TB. That means that the entire family of 6 or 8 people has to be eliminated. Well, when you do that, the Catholic agency will start putting pressure where it can, so that these 8 people could be brought in.

Mr. ARENS. You don't specify the Catholic agency as an individual agency?

Dr. WEBER. I am a Catholic myself, so I am picking up the Catholic agency as a figure of speech.

Mr. ARENS. I understand. I wanted the record to be clear on that.

Dr. WEBER. Unless you were in Europe and you saw how this thing worked, you couldn't understand. I mean, it would be difficult to explain, in a few words. But the political screening in some zones was done in a very shoddy manner. It was ideal if the Russians wanted to send agents over here. It was the ideal set-up for them to do so.

Now, in the American Zone, we had the CIC, that did a very good screening.

In the French Zone, with the French authorities, they had the best records of DP's, and they cooperated with us.

In the British Zone, we had no cooperation by the British.

The screening had to be done mainly by the Displaced Persons Commission employees who went over to the British Zone and did the political screening. They had no training whatsoever. And because of their inclination, they were inclined to overlook a few things about the DP's, so that it was perfectly possible to get in Communist agents.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know anything about the intelligence screening in the DP program?

Dr. WEBER. I lived with the whole program. I was with the vice consuls who were attached to the DP camps and were screening these people. They all felt in some cases it was just, well, they had to go through.

Mr. ARENS. I am sure the committee is very much interested in the security screening aside from what the law says, the Communist agents should not come in, the committee is interested in procedures which would give us the highest degree of precaution against the Communist agents or undesirables brought into this country. What suggestions do you have, if any, to the committee on that score?

Dr. WEBER. The personnel of the Immigration and Naturalization Bureau should be put in complete charge of this program; that they do the screening; they do the medical screening with a representative of the agencies within the Immigration and Naturalization Office. The Displaced Persons Commission had thousands of employees there working there, doing what I do not know. I was there. I did not do anything. I lived in one of the plush apartments built in Frankfurt. I had a very good cellar. I bought everything at the PX. I could have lived off the fat of the land.

Mr. ARENS. How could these 3,000 tubercular cases get through if you were vigilant?

Dr. WEBER. The procedures were these: These patients were in the camp. There were 6 camps in Germany and 7 in Austria. The people were X-rayed at the IRO offices first, then they were X-rayed with 25 millimeter films. Those films were read by the IRO physicians and then sent to the American office where we had German physicians employed to read the films again. Both the physicians of the IRO and the Displaced Persons Commission were not qualified to read those films according to American standards. So I requested that I read all the positive films of all these camps so that I could pass on the diseased persons according to American standards.

I was refused that. I could read only the films which the German physicians saw fit to show me, which were very few. Then I requested that the X-ray equipment be changed by the application of the larger lens. It would cost only \$1,500 per unit. There were about 13 units.

So that we could have larger films, so that they could be interpreted much better. I was refused that.

Now, I will tell you another thing. We had screenings in Berlin, at the American Consulate in Berlin, for DP's. The days that we had sessions in Berlin we went to Berlin to do that work. Where the consulate was the street was lined by private limousines with chauffeurs and they were all DP's that were coming here.

Mr. ARENS. In Berlin?

Dr. WEBER. Yes, and they were in the black market. They got their visa, they came over here, established residence here and then got the reentry permit to this country and flew back to Berlin and continued their black market operations in Berlin until the immigration authorities got wise to this thing and they changed that whole thing.

I do not know if I have given you any useful information in my rambling speech, but I thought when I was sitting here this morning it was my duty to tell you that if you are going to establish another Displaced Persons Commission, you are going to have the same troubles we had 3 years ago.

Senator WATKINS. As the present act of Congress works, outside of a Coordinator and small staff, the Immigration Service will handle most of these matters.

Dr. WEBER. That will be excellent because I think the Immigration and Naturalization Bureau was the best agency in Germany. You could not put anything over them, I can tell you that.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you, Doctor, for coming forward and making that statement.

Dr. WEBER. Thank you for letting me talk.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Quinn.

State for the purpose of the record your name, your address, and your occupation.

**STATEMENT OF DANIEL P. QUINN, CHILD CARE CONSULTANT,
CATHOLIC COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES, NEW YORK CITY**

Mr. QUINN. My name is Daniel P. Quinn. I am child care consultant of the Catholic Committee for Refugees, 265 West 14th Street, New York City.

Senator WATKINS. Are you for or against this measure?

Mr. QUINN. I am for it.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed. I will have to limit you.

Mr. QUINN. It will take me less than 5 minutes.

The Catholic Committee for Refugees, located at 265 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y., is an organization operating under a charter of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C. The executive director is the Right Reverend Monsignor Emil N. Komora. The committee has been in existence for 16 years and its original function was to assist refugees from nazism. Subsequently it functioned in behalf of displaced persons under the President's directive. On the passage of the DP Act of 1948 it undertook work in behalf of displaced priests, displaced teachers, and displaced war orphans.

This statement will confine itself to S. 1917 to the extent that it has to do with orphans. When we use the term "orphan" we use it in the sense described by sections 2 (e) and 2 (f) of the DP Act of

1948 as amended. Hundreds of requests have come to our office for these orphans and reports from abroad indicate that many orphans are still in need of aid and available.

Whereas there is no specific provision for orphans under S. 1917, it would appear that under this bill the definitions given under section 2 (a) ("escapee"), section 2 (b) ("German expellee"), and section 2 (c) ("national") would under section 4 make eligible expellee, escapee, Italian, Greek, and Netherlands orphans. However, with reference to orphans who might come under the aforementioned provisions, it would be highly desirable in view of the complexity of processing orphans that a priority be given such orphans under section 11 of S. 1917. Without such a priority, it is quite conceivable that in the last few months of operation inadequate numbers or none will be available for orphans. Incidentally, section 3 of S. 1917, page 3, line 4, "including adopted children," does not apply to this foregoing, since the orphans we have in mind have not as yet been adopted, but would come here for guardianship or adoption.

However, there are two additional categories of orphans which we feel should be included in a bill of this nature: namely, (1) orphans who were born in Germany or Austria of DP (now apparently grouped under the term "escapee") parents; and (2) orphans who were born in Germany or Austria of German or Austrian parents.

If we read the bill correctly, no provision is made for category 1. Our doubt arises from the definition of "escapee" under section 2 (a): namely, that an "escapee means any person who during or after World War II has left," and so forth. Now, these orphans were born in Germany and Austria of DP parents and have never "left" Soviet or Communist areas.

With reference to category 2, it would appear that no provision whatsoever has been made. Clearly, orphans falling under the Austrian quota would face hopeless delay under our basic immigration law because of oversubscription, and reliance on undersubscription of the German quota in the future would be too hazardous a proposition on which to embark upon a program of bringing such orphans to American homes within a reasonable time or within the life of the act.

May we respectfully submit that an efficient remedy for the difficulties mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs might be secured by inserting into S. 1917 some provisions from H. R. 4842 (Carigg): namely, section 2 (d) and section 4 (h).

We are keenly interested in this problem and we believe the facilities for doing a socially sound job are available. Procedures are surrounded with the necessary safeguards designed for the best interests of the child and his prospective American parents and hence the national interest. Detailed case histories are made available to recognized social agencies in the several States authorized to place children for adoption and supervision and responsibility is assumed by these local agencies. We are well aware of the reasons for the defeat of the Armstrong amendment during the debate on Public Law 414, but we humbly submit that the social techniques and skills gained by experience under section 2 (e) and section (f) of the DP Act of 1948 have brought forth the means to overcome these difficulties. Granted a good statute and adequate regulations, we feel a delicate problem of this

nature can be handled properly and with substantial benefit to this country.

May we, therefore, earnestly commend for your sympathetic consideration the inclusion in S. 1917 of a special section providing for orphans. We are confident in this matter since we know beyond the shadow of a doubt that even the very thought that our Congress might turn its back on orphans is repugnant. Our experience with over 1,700 of these orphans and our observation of their adjustment and assimilation in American homes have convinced us that such a program is sound and that it is a worthwhile investment in the future of these United States.

Mr. ARENS. Could you tell us, Doctor, where the orphans are that you are particularly concerned about and the numbers and the ages?

Mr. QUINN. We have a figure of 600 refugee children in Germany under the age of 10. The average age is between 2 and 4. We have a figure of 500 in Italy under the age of 10 and 500 in Italy over the age of 10. At the time of this meeting we had not been able to get our figure from Austria.

Mr. ARENS. You have a relatively small number of orphans.

Mr. QUINN. It is around 1,600 plus whatever it will be in Austria.

Mr. ARENS. What is your definition of "an orphan," both parents deceased or one parent deceased?

Mr. QUINN. Under section 2 (e) of the act.

Mr. ARENS. The same as the DP Act?

Mr. QUINN. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. Would you envisage in your suggestion you have here that the prospective parent in the United States--adoptive parents--would give some kind of assurance that they will adopt the child in the United States upon the arrival of the child? What do you contemplate will be done?

Mr. QUINN. The child will be admitted for adoption or legal guardianship such as under section 2 (f).

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of assurance of adoptive parents?

Mr. QUINN. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any other areas in the world in which you have concern about orphans?

Mr. QUINN. No, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Do you contemplate under the program which you suggest that the orphans would be brought in on any kind of blanket assurance by voluntary agencies or they would come exclusively to parents in a specified particular home?

Mr. QUINN. I foresee it operating on the basis of the last program whereby the National Catholic Welfare Conference would give that assurance.

Mr. ARENS. That they would adopt them out after they got over here?

Mr. QUINN. That is right. The way we operated before, we had homes ready before the children would come.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have language to suggest to the committee on the suspension of those particular provisions of the law, the present law, which require the children be accompanied by a parent, and so forth? Do you have language you want to suggest?

Mr. QUINN. No, sir; I have no language other than the definition as mentioned in the previous act.

Mr. ARENS. Would you be good enough to do two things? Would you be good enough to supply the committee at the earliest possible date the statistics which you have, not just guesses but the facts on the number of orphans in each of the areas which you have information on, on the basis of some definition of "orphans" and the ages of the orphans.

Mr. QUINN. Could we accept the definition—

Mr. ARENS. Just any definition you want; give us something to get hold of.

Mr. QUINN. All right, sir. What about the Carigg definition? Mr. Carigg in his bill defined "orphans."

Mr. ARENS. Is the definition in the DP Act not about as good as any you can find?

Mr. QUINN. That is the same one, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Why do you not use that one?

Mr. QUINN. Is that all, sir?

Senator WATKINS. I have no questions.

Mr. ARENS. Just one other thing. What is your attitude on the inclusion of children adopted overseas by American personnel?

Mr. QUINN. I think, sir, that is taken care of in Mr. Walter's bill.

Mr. ARENS. That is not law.

Mr. QUINN. I think it is a good idea.

Mr. ARENS. Do you contemplate that these will be only refugee orphans or any orphans?

Mr. QUINN. I would consider not only refugee but German and Austrian orphans, too.

Mr. ARENS. You had better put that in your statement, too. I think that would help clarify your position.

Mr. QUINN. All right, sir.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing before you.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

MEMORANDUM ON INCLUSION OF AN ORPHAN SECTION IN S. 1917, SUBMITTED BY
CATHOLIC COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES

INTRODUCTION

On May 26, 1953, Mr. Daniel P. Quinn, child care consultant of this committee read a statement at the hearing held by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, urging the inclusion of an orphan section in S. 1917. Subsequent thereto Mr. Richard Arens requested further information and we are pleased to submit this in the following paragraphs.

STATISTICS

The following figures in round numbers are those given us by War Relief Services—NCWC offices at Frankfurt, Salzburg, and Rome. We believe they are reliable and indicate the number of orphans in need of aid and available. Again they are orphans which would be serviced by our committee. We have no figures as to the number which would be serviced by other religious organizations. When we use the term "orphan" we use it as defined in sections 2 (e) and 2 (f) of the DP Act of 1948 as amended. The classifications below are on the basis of location, parentage, and age.

(A) German Federal Republic:	
DP under age 10.....	800
German under age 10.....	845
Total.....	945
(B) Austria:	
DP and Austrian under age 10.....	500
(C) Italy:	
Italian under age 10.....	500
Italian over age 10.....	500
Total.....	1,000
Grand total.....	2,445
Total orphans under age 10.....	1,945
Total orphans over age 10.....	500
Grand total.....	2,445

SUGGESTED ADDITIONS TO S. 1917

Whereas a separate and complete section for orphans might be inserted in S. 1917, these suggestions have been set out to conform to the drafting of this bill. Basically they follow the language of sections 2 (e) and 2 (f) of the DP Act of 1948 as amended.

I. Addition at the end of section 2 of a new paragraph as follows:

"(d) 'Orphan' means any person who, (1) at the time of issuance of a visa is under the age of eighteen years and (2) is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or because of abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such orphan and agrees to release him for emigration and adoption or guardianship;"

The reason why the age is put at under 18 is twofold, namely, in order to keep sibling groups together where one or the other child may be over age 10 and secondly, to assist those who would come to relatives and are over 10.

II. Addition to section 3: It seems to us that it would facilitate matters and be a fine gesture on the part of Congress to add 3,500 special quota visas for orphans in addition to the 240,000 provided. However, if the latter figure must be retained at precisely that level then (barring nonquota visas) it would mean that 3,500 visas would have to be subtracted from the allocations in section 4. This is rather difficult since we do not know the number and nationalities of orphans which other religious groups would process under the several allocations of section 4, and hence we would not know the fair number to be subtracted from each allocation. Judging from past performance under the DP Act it would appear that a total of 3,500 special quota visas is realistic. Our Committee is presently geared to handle 700 orphans a year and with rather young orphans probably could increase the number to 800 a year.

III. Addition at the end of section 4 (a) of a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) Not to exceed three thousand five hundred visas to orphans residing in the area of the German Federal Republic, Western sector of Berlin, Austria or within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey or in the Free Territory of Trieste."

(1) It will be noted that the foregoing suggestion is more comprehensive than section 4 with reference to areas of residence. Whereas the orphans in which we are interested are located in Germany, Austria, and Italy, and hence inclusion of these areas would serve our purpose, nevertheless other groups might wish the inclusion of other areas, e. g., Greece. It is obvious when one bears in mind the vast upheavals and tragedies of today's Europe that orphans do not constitute an exclusive problem of any one religious group.

(2) If a special provision such as this is written into S. 1917 there would be no competition for numbers between adults and orphans and hence no need of a priority for orphans under section 11.

IV. Addition at the end of section 6 (a) of two provisos as follows:

“Provided, That a person who qualifies under section 4 (a) (6) of this Act has assurances submitted in his behalf for admission to the United States for permanent residence with a near relative or with a person who is a citizen of the United States or an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or is seeking to enter the United States to come to a public or private agency approved by the Coordinator, and such relative, person, or agency gives assurances satisfactory to the Coordinator that adoption or guardianship proceedings will be initiated with respect to such alien: Provided further, That satisfactory assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Coordinator have been given that such alien, if admitted into the United States, will be cared for properly.”

It seems to us that the latter provision covers section 212 (a) (15) of Public Law 414. We believe that the assurances of proper care together with the regulations framed pursuant to the DP Act of 1948 as amended were adequate to cover the “public charge” and “unaccompanied children” provisions of the act of 1917, section 3. In our view, care of a child would not be proper if he were allowed to become a public charge.

However, if it is felt that an assurance of proper care is inadequate, then a further clause might be added to the second provision reading “and that any such alien will not become a public charge.” In this connection, aside from necessity of authorized agencies to maintain adequate social safeguards, there is also the continuing responsibility of these agencies where an individual placement breaks down and a new placement becomes mandatory.

Senator WATKINS. That concludes our list of witnesses for today. We will now recess until tomorrow morning at 9:30.

(Whereupon, at 3:45 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 9:30 a. m., May 27, 1953.)

EMERGENCY MIGRATION OF ESCAPEES, EXPELLEES, AND REFUGEES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 9:30 a. m., in the Old Supreme Court room, the Capitol, Senator Arthur V. Watkins presiding.

Present: Senators Watkins, Welker, Butler, and Eastland.

Also present: Richard Arens, staff director; Drury Blair, staff member; and O. K. Earl, staff member.

Senator WATKINS. The committee will be in session.

We will begin this morning with Congressman Walter Judd, from Minnesota.

Congressman, we are very happy to have you with us. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER H. JUDD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Representative JUDD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Walter H. Judd. I am a Member of Congress from the Fifth District of Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the privilege of appearing before you with respect to S. 1917.

Let me say at the outset that I, of course, approve the stated purpose of this bill, particularly that of issuing special quota immigrant visas to escapees and expellees who are unfortunate victims of the kind of persecution and tyranny that is abroad in our world. But I regret the limitations of the bill, which provide that these are to be issued only to "certain escapees, German expellees, nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands." Because if the bill purports to be taking care of escapees from Communist tyranny, it is ignoring the largest and neediest group in the whole world who come under this qualification.

Second, the bill purports to be without discrimination as to race, religion, or national origin; yet if it were to become law in its present form, it would be the worst act of racial discrimination and exclusion in our immigration laws since the disastrous 1924 so-called Exclusion Act, which also ignored one-half of the people in the world, all those of the yellow and the brown races.

If I may just point this up by reading from the President's letter to the Speaker of the House recommending the passage of this bill, it says:

We are all aware of the tragic developments of the last several years which have left countless thousands of individuals homeless refugees in the heart of Europe.

Well, I hope we are aware of the same sort of homeless refugees in other places than the heart of Europe.

Again it says:

In recent months the number of refugees has been increased by the steady flow of escapees who have braved death to escape from behind the Iron Curtain.

Well, there is an Iron Curtain in Asia, too, except that it was called the Bamboo Curtain for a time; and there is a still larger number of people who have braved death to escape from behind that curtain of tyranny in China than there is of such escapees in Europe.

Then it says:

In addition, the problem of population pressures continues to be a source of urgent concern in several friendly countries in Europe.

I must ask again: why "in Europe"? Because, if we are going to deal with population pressures in friendly countries, the population pressures are much more acute in other areas of the world than they are in Europe, or at least as acute as in any spot in Europe.

Now, it is concern for such considerations that makes me come before the committee this morning, not to oppose the passage of this bill, but to urge its modification so that it will be genuinely what it purports to be.

There are two proper motives, I am sure, behind this bill. One is human sympathy, and the other is concern for the security and the well-being of the United States.

On either count, it seems to me, it should include some provision for the people to whom I have referred, escapees from Communist tyranny in China and refugees in the Arab camps in the Middle East; because from the standpoint of human need, they are in much more dire straits than are these folks who would be taken care of from Western Europe.

And from the standpoint of the security of the United States, to exclude them will, in my judgment, do irreparable damage to the well-being and security of the United States, in those areas where it has already been damaged most, in those areas where we are weakest, in those areas where we are already at the greatest disadvantage, and where, to put it bluntly, we have been taking a licking.

In 1928 the Kremlin, at its Sixth World Congress in Moscow, made a basic decision, and that was to abandon, for the moment at least, the basic thesis of Karl Marx that the Communist revolution was inevitable in the industrialized countries. They were not making any headway in the industrialized countries. And so they adopted, at the 1928 Congress, what is called Thesis on the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and Semicolonies. That became their modification of Marxian theory and strategy, at least a modified tactic, whereby they kept our attention focused on Europe, while they concentrated their efforts on Asia. Up until that time they had not had, and to this day have not had, too great success in Europe, but their success in Asia has been nothing short of phenomenal and, I use the word carefully, terrifying.

Senator WATKINS. I think you know, Congressman, I share many of your views on where the important contest is taking place. In fact, I argued back in the days of the North Atlantic Pact that I was very much alarmed over that situation, because they were concentrating all their energies on Europe, under the idea and the theory that the Communist blueprint meant an invasion and a strike in Europe, ignoring the back door, so called, of the United States.

Representative JUDD. That is right. The Communists did not give up on "target Europe," but they decided the better way to get to that target was to move across Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, and cut Europe off from its materials and markets.

Senator WATKINS. And thereby take in hundreds of millions of people to use for cannon fodder.

Representative JUDD. That is right. And look at their success. My position, sir, is that we ought to try to be in the general neighborhood of being as intelligent and wise and skillful in our handling of our affairs as the Communists have been in handling theirs. If they see that the way to get ahead is to work among the non-Caucasian races, why can we not see it is just as essential to our security to do likewise? If we cannot yet do positive things in Asia, we should at least not slap them in the face by passing bills that limit our concern only to those of the same color as we are.

Senator WATKINS. May I say in connection with this that, if you will note, it is designated as an emergency act.

Representative JUDD. That is true. And the emergency is greater in Hong Kong and among the Arab refugees than it is in any of these countries in Europe.

Senator WATKINS. The President had in mind, I think, this situation: that you cannot always move on all fronts at the same time. Now, our immigration policy, our permanent policy, was fixed in the 1952 act.

Representative JUDD. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. And this is one of the emergency type. I think it should be made clear, as far as I am concerned, personally, and I think on the part of my cosponsors, that we have no idea of trying to make it a slap in the face of the Asiatics or trying to make it in any way an exclusion of them, because it is an emergency on a front that the President seemed to feel we ought to move on and take some definite action. Now, whether it is wise to include the others is, of course, one of the problems we will have to decide in the committee. I welcome your suggestions. We had a witness yesterday who made the same sort of suggestion you are now making, and I feel it is worthy of consideration by the committee, and I assure you it will be considered in the final draft of whatever legislation comes out.

May I say this particular legislation is an attempt to meet the President's request, and it is in direct response to his letter. If he had indicated that the emergency was as bad over in Asia as he has indicated it is in Europe, the probabilities are that the legislation would have been drawn to take care of Asia. But perhaps we ought not to take in the whole waterfront in one step.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with S. 1766, sponsored by the Senator from Utah?

Representative JUDD. I have not studied that as carefully as I have this bill, sir. I have noted summaries of its basic purposes and provisions.

Mr. ARENS. Although it does not purport to be an immigration bill, it would establish an office which would have a concern in addition to the Central European refugees, one which would extend to your refugees in the Far East as well as in the Middle East.

Representative JUDD. I support wholeheartedly that concept. Because this is one of the most ticklish problems in the whole world. And we can move with the best of intentions and still make the most incredible blunders, we need a worldwide approach.

In reply to what you said, Senator, about not taking in the whole waterfront, I agree that we cannot solve the whole immigration and population pressure problems of the world in any one piece of legislation. But we ought not to pass legislation which does us positive harm. And I will say this flatly, that for the Congress of the United States to pick this moment to pass this legislation in its present form is to do just as much good to the enemies of everything you and I believe in as if it had been written in the Kremlin itself. Because it says to a billion people in Asia, "These Americans do not care about you. All they care about is white men. You are the wrong color. You cannot get into the white man's club." And what other club is there? The only other club is the one run from the Kremlin.

Senator WATKINS. We removed the bars in principle, however, in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952.

Mr. ARENS. The record should reflect that those provisions are basically Congressman Judd's bill.

Representative JUDD. All the provisions of my bill to end racial discrimination were incorporated in that, yes.

Senator WATKINS. I congratulate you on that step.

While you are here, let us talk practicalities. How many people do you think we should admit, under the thesis you now have? How many should we take into consideration? How many can we absorb without doing us damage in the Asiatic countries?

Representative JUDD. I think the number of people in these two groups, the Arab refugees and the Chinese refugees or escapees, who will qualify individually under our laws, or rather strict requirements for immigrants, would not be too great. And as I understand, S. 1917 does not waive for any applicant, the basic qualifications which every immigrant to the United States must have.

Senator WATKINS. Right.

Representative JUDD. And I think that is proper. My guess is that if you went through with a fine-tooth comb, you could not find very many qualified people in either of these groups.

Mr. ARENS. You have three groups, your Chinese, your Arabs, and your whites in China.

Representative JUDD. Yes; the latter is a relatively small group. I was speaking primarily here of the non-Caucasians. Of course, the Arabs are not strictly non-Caucasians; but the Arab refugees are Asians, rather than European peoples, and so are excluded, actually, in the very definitions and limitations in the bill. You referred, Mr. Arens, to the Russians, or the people in China of the Caucasian race, who are descendants of white Russians who fled from Russia at the

time of the Red revolution in 1917. There were also in China for a time a good many Europeans, several thousand, who had gone to China in the late thirties as refugees from Hitler's persecutions in Germany and Austria, and the United Nations Refugee Commission went out and helped in getting a lot of those folks out.

That is one of the things that emphasizes the discrimination. The people of Asia see representatives of the United Nations spending money to save a little handful of people of the Caucasian race who are refugees, and just passing by without one cent for those of the non-Caucasian races.

Mr. ARENS. What are your statistics, Congressman, first of all on your Hong Kong Chinese?

Representative JUDD. There are over a million and a quarter refugees and escapees from Communist China in Hong Kong. The population was only about 800,000 at the end of the war, and now it is 2¼ million.

Mr. ARENS. Now, I understand from private conversation with you the other day at this dinner that you are identified with a group that have been moving some of these people to Formosa. I think it would be very helpful to the committee if you would be good enough to give the committee a word about your organization and how it is financed.

Representative JUDD. Well, there are in this group of refugees in Hong Kong some individuals whom I have known in the past, both when I was out in China and when they were students in our country. I tried to get several foundations interested, and I tried to get our Government interested, and I tried to get the International Refugee Commission and various other groups interested, and nobody would pay any attention to it. Finally, in order to be able to sleep nights, I started out with 3 or 4 other people who felt the same way, and we organized a committee called "Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals Inc." I sent out a letter the first of December 1951, to a group of several hundred people to see whether there was any interest, whether there was any response, whether the American people cared. And the response was far better than I expected. So I said, "It is clear that our people are aware of this problem. They are interested. They do not know what to do or how."

So, in addition to my other work, which I sometimes had to neglect, I have given a lot of my time for the last year and a half to the development of this organization, Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc. It has a very distinguished board of directors, and it has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my life to see the number of high grade people in our country, busy as anybody could be, who have given of their money and time, have gone to meetings, and have written letters and raised money to help these refugees.

Mr. ARENS. What do you do, Congressman?

Representative JUDD. First, we had to find out what the situation was. There were all kinds of stories. Obviously, we could not go into general relief. A private agency cannot handle a million and a quarter refugees. So inasmuch as my primary interest had been challenged by those who are what we would call intellectuals, that is, graduates of American universities and Chinese universities, and so forth, we set up an office in Hong Kong, and as quietly as we could, sent around a questionnaire and made a census. We have in our files

the filled-out questionnaires of 27,000 people, who have what can be called a college education, or the equivalent thereof.

Now, among them, more than 2,000 have degrees from American colleges. Some of them have 3 or 4 degrees. There are doctors of jurisprudence and education. There are 10 or 12 Ph. D.'s from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. There are engineers, physicians, scientists, scholars, physicists. One was a top nuclear physicist whom the Communists were trying their best to get back into China, and he wouldn't go.

These people were in despair, more spiritual despair than physical need. Most of them had some resources, or they could not even have made this bold venture out from behind the Iron Curtain. But they have eaten up those resources. They have lived off their relatives. And the fact that the free world which called them to resist Communist tyranny and be true to their principles now allowed them to starve and to rot professionally and to deteriorate spiritually, was heartbreaking.

Mr. ARENS. All of them were geographically located in Hong Kong?

Representative JUDD. We have not touched anybody except in Hong Kong. The great bulk are there.

So we made plans. We have 3 or 4 projects. The big one is to resettle these folks. Hong Kong itself is no secure position. We have tried to get them into various places, Brazil or down into some of the relatively unoccupied parts of Southeast Asia, Timor, and some of those East Indian islands. But the best and easiest place to relocate them was in Formosa.

We had difficulty in the beginning. The people on Formosa did not have enough food and shelter for themselves. They did not want to take any more people in. The natives of Formosa were particularly resentful about more Chinese "mainlanders," as they called them, coming in.

Then there was the problem of security. At that time there was a lot of Communist infiltration, and the Chinese Government on Formosa was understandably afraid there would be more infiltration.

In the last year and a quarter, we have raised a quarter of a million dollars, and we have now relocated, as of the 30th of April, almost 250 families. That is an average of a man and his wife and two children.

Mr. ARENS. Any Government aid at all of any consequence?

Representative JUDD. No. We have just raised it ourselves. I got \$25,000 from each of three foundations to help us in the beginning, and the rest has been raised a little here and a little there. But in the new mutual security bill before Congress there is a provision for several million dollars for refugee work, and I think we will be able to get some of that. The new authorization bill is before my Committee on Foreign Affairs now and then there will have to be appropriations.

But it just seemed to us incredible to ignore these needy people. For they are persons who, one, know ancient China and her culture. Two, they are trained in our western universities, and they believe in the West. They would not be refugees if they did not believe in the West and our ideas of freedom. And, three, they know communism. They are in a better position to produce literature, to tell the story of the

conflict of ideas and arms in that crucial part of the world than anyone else. They can be the leaven that can go back into China if and when she is liberated and rebuild the intellectual ideas that they, like we, think are necessary for a good world. Without them it cannot be done, even if the Communists were overthrown.

Mr. ARENS. Just to probe your thinking, Congressman, as you know under the Judd bill, which is incorporated in the Immigration and Nationality Act, your Asiatic countries, all of them, have minimum quotas, plus your Asiatic Pacific triangle, your minimum quota of a hundred.

In order that there would not be a disproportionate number of Asiatics in any contemplated bill, to the number of Asiatics in the United States, what would you think of a suggestion that popped into my mind just now, of a ratio in the countries which have refugees of so many times their quota? You see, if you start with 240,000 and undertake to give, say, 240,000 to the Asian countries, you have more people coming into this country of Asian ancestry than can be assimilated, because of the Asians here.

Representative JUDD. That is right. They do not have enough people here of their own background to associate with and to guide them and assist them.

Mr. ARENS. So my thought, then, went to the question of what formula could be worked out which would be fair and equitable on that whole theory. And if you take, say, 10 times the quota of the country in which there is a refugee, you would have 10 times 100 for China, which would be a thousand, and 10 times the quota for Italy. What is Italy's quota? Around 6,000? That would give you 60,000. You see, you could have a ratio worked that way. What do you think of that, just off the cuff, Congressman?

Representative JUDD. I wondered, myself, when I read this bill where the figures of 75,000 for Italy, 20,000 for Greece, 20,000 for Netherlands, and so forth, came from, whether there was some formula behind it. I could not detect any.

Mr. ARENS. Apparently not.

Senator WATKINS. There was no formula, as I understand it. It was based on the political necessity in waging the cold war, largely.

Representative JUDD. On that kind of basis, I am sure there has got to be some inclusion. Actually, a few thousand—

Mr. ARENS. Ten times a hundred for China would be a thousand. That would be a fair ratio, would it not?

Representative JUDD. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. So you could convince the people of the Far East that we are not discriminating against them.

Representative JUDD. That is exactly what I mean. I am not sticking to a particular number here, or a percentage. And I did not in the original Judd Act. The objective was equality of status, not equality of numbers; so that there would be no stigma attached to them that they are unworthy because of their race. Because that is just dynamite against our cause.

Mr. ARENS. I notice your comment with respect to the Arabs. I have made a considerable study, to be quite frank, of the Arab situation, along with the situation in these other areas of the world, because of our interest in the refugee problem. Basically, I think the Arab

governments do not want their people to immigrate. What would be your reaction there?

Representative JUDD. That is probably true. Naturally, we are not going to inveigle or urge anyone to come if they do not want to come. But I think that there has to be some opportunity for qualified individuals from these groups, to get into the United States if they so desire, if we are to have intelligent concern for the political necessities of the cold war.

I came over here today without a definite proposal, because I have not studied it as thoroughly as you on the committee. But I am sure, sir, some provision can be worked out by you and your experts on the committee staff that will give recognition and some equality of treatment to these individuals who, if we mean anything at all by what we say, are equal human beings in the sight of God and in the concern of our people.

Mr. ARENS. Could you give us one word now, Mr. Congressman, if you please, on the number of whites? I understand there are some White Russians still left in Hong Kong, relatively few. There was a man who attended this dinner over here the other day that talked about that.

Representative JUDD. Yes. It seems to me he said the total, counting in Tientsin, Peiping, Shanghai, Manchuria, and so on, is something like 15,000.

Mr. ARENS. And I believe you said about 6,000 of them had already worked out some kind of arrangement to go to South America.

Representative JUDD. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. So there would be about 9,000 left.

Representative JUDD. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any accurate statistical information on those people?

Representative JUDD. No; I have not. The speaker seemed to have, and he is a very reliable person from everything I have ever heard. But I do have accurate information on the group of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong. Actually, to be complete in my statement, our committee's concern was not to get those Chinese leaders into the United States. Our concern was to preserve them so that when the day comes that China is free they can go back into their own country. They are needed more in their own country. If there was some place where they could go during this period and be preserved and do useful work, that would be what would be desired.

Mr. ARENS. What about Chiang Kai-shek taking them into Formosa in more numbers than you have been able to get over there?

Representative JUDD. We are moving about as rapidly as he can or as we can with a small private agency. These refugees have got to be cleared individually. They do not have any papers, you see. They are in Hong Kong, which does not recognize the Nationalist Government. They are refugees from Chinese Communists. They have no Nationalist papers. They have no Communist papers. It is a terrific job of screening, and our organization has to render this service of trying to get their papers straightened out.

Then we have to get specific jobs lined up for them. The Formosans do not want to take them in to be just refugees there. They want them only when we have lined up a job for a schoolteacher or a doctor, or a job for an agriculturalist, or a Chinese who can serve as an inter-

preter with our Armed Forces over there, because he knows English very well. We send these men and their families over to Formosa only when they can go to almost pinpointed jobs. The problem of securing the openings for them in Formosa is one of our major problems.

We hope this year to move 1,000 families. I think we are going to make it. But this law must also give recognition to these people by permitting some of them to come to the United States.

Mr. ARENS. Is this appropriation you were talking about a minute ago, Congressman Judd, contemplated by a substantive law before the Appropriations Committee, such that it sets up any kind of agency to give relief to the Chinese?

Representative JUDD. No. I think they would use with careful supervision this agency, Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, as far as resettlement is concerned.

Mr. ARENS. To whom was the money contemplated?

Representative JUDD. It goes to Mutual Security Administration. The law has in it a provision that some lawyers say is adequate to permit handling these as a part of our own defense necessities in that part of the world. There was also debate as to whether they could not be handled under the Kersten amendment.

Mr. ARENS. The Kersten amendment would only be for Europe, would it not?

Representative JUDD. Yes, but it may be modified.

Mr. ARENS. Now, let me ask you this. Do you have information just in résumé form on the Korean refugees?

Representative JUDD. No; I have not studied that carefully. I think that those refugees, if we can get a peace that reunites their country and gives them security, prefer to stay where they are. And I should think the thing to do would be to take care of them where they are, until such time as there is some definitive settlement one way or the other which lets you know whether there is hope for that country, or nothing but despair for them.

Mr. ARENS. Why is it that the United Nations is operating in Korea, spending considerable money there, and it is not doing anything for your Chinese refugees in Hong Kong? Is there any political reason? I mean, "political" in the broadest possible sense.

Representative JUDD. Well, I would rather not discuss that here. In Hong Kong we have to deal with the British Government, which is, to put it this way, anxious to provoke nobody. We have to deal with the Chinese Nationalist Government. We have to deal with the American Government, because we are an American corporation. And we have to deal with these refugees who have relatives at home in Communist China, and who are, some of them, about to the point where they would just as soon commit suicide as go back behind the Iron Curtain. Therefore, I would rather not make comments on the overall political situation in that part of the world. I do not want to stir up animus. We are a nonpolitical organization.

Mr. ARENS. However, if some legislation were to be evolved which would undertake even to do a token something for these Chinese refugees, the Government here would be confronted with the issue as to whether or not there is a political problem in trying to do something for the refugees there.

Representative JUDD. Yes. But, on the basis of a year and a half of experience, I am convinced there would be no obstacle placed in our way there by the British Government. These folks are a terrific burden on Hong Kong. They would be glad to get them out of there. You can be sure of that. So I do not think you would find difficulties, obstacles, put in the way.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Representative JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge that the committee make some provision, a few thousand or something of the sort, for qualified refugees in other areas than just Europe. Because, I repeat, that to pass it in its present form can only give substance to the Communist charges all through Asia, which have been so successful in winning people away from our side in the cold war. It cannot but give substance to their charge that the United States is interested only in white people, and that the billion people who live in Asia, half the people of the world, the ones who are tipping the scale against us in the cold war, are of no concern to us. And for us to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in the cold war, for us to have lost 28,000 American lives in Korea to try to prevent Communist conquest there, and then help give the whole area away by an act which makes no recognition of the importance of individuals of other races than our own seems to me poor economy and bad security and a forgetting of all the principles we say we are fighting for.

Thank you very much.

Senator WATKINS. Doctor, you have given us some idea about the number involved. As I said before, I think the committee will probably look with sympathetic consideration on your suggestions here.

Representative JUDD. I would say 5,000 or 10,000 or something like that of these carefully screened, qualified individuals.

Senator WATKINS. And you would have them submitted to the same kind of a screening as required under the 1952 act?

Representative JUDD. Certainly. And that is why, although there are a million and a quarter refugees, when you screen that way, the great bulk could not qualify under our immigration laws.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any comment to make on any screening which your private agents have been able to do from the standpoint of screening out subversives?

Representative JUDD. We have been very careful on that, and of course before the Chinese Government will take them, it has to screen them with its own secret service.

Mr. ARENS. Do they have the facilities for that over there?

Representative JUDD. Well, yes. There are Chinese agencies in Hong Kong. The British cooperate on that. They allow these Chinese Government agencies, even though they do not recognize the Chinese Government, to be there and interview these persons and investigate their family connections and go back into their papers. Because, naturally, the Chinese Government is not going to allow Chinese refugees to come in who will be Communist agents. Every family that we resettle in Formosa has got to be cleared, of course, by the Chinese Government.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, I have one question.

Senator WATKINS. Go ahead.

Senator WELKER. I, as usual, came late, and I missed one portion of your statement. With respect to the Chinese intellectuals, will that

cause any ill will, when you single them out, as between the intellectual bracket and the hard working laboring class of refugees?

Representative Judd. No. It will cause much less in China than in any other country in the world, because the Chinese since Confucius' day, at least, have had a respect for the scholar that I think is not equaled any place else in the world. They, themselves, have always put up in the top bracket the scholar. And their greatest aspiration is for themselves and their children to become scholars. For these mature Chinese scholars who have been educated abroad to have this privilege of being saved for useful work is something that the Chinese working people and the other refugees will cheer, even though they themselves are left out. Because they are so devoted to this concept of preserving their basic culture and literature and philosophy. They are exceedingly proud of it, even the illiterate ones. They are proud of the Chinese scholarship, and they want to preserve it.

I sometimes think of this. We spend millions of dollars every year in some ruins in Ur or Egypt or Asia Minor, trying to find out something about a culture that has gone. The Chinese culture is one of the greatest cultures in all of history. It has the longest continuous history. It is magnificent in many respects. And it is being destroyed right before our eyes, and we do not lift a finger to prevent it, so that 4,000 years from now somebody may be digging among the ruins to try to find out what art, what poetry, what philosophies existed in this ancient culture. The Communists know they have got to destroy this culture, this way of life, this way of thinking, or it will eventually absorb them. So they are out to destroy the books and destroy the scholars and eliminate the ideas from people's minds.

Senator WATKINS. Doctor, do you not concede that the United States is now spending a good many billions of dollars over in Asia to try to eventually free the Chinese people? I thought you said we were not making any kind of a contribution. We are making about all the contribution we can make.

Representative Judd. If I said that, I misspoke myself. We are not making a contribution with respect to the refugees. No one is more aware than I of the enormous contribution that we are making along military and economic lines, but, in my judgment, it will not be successful if we insult the people and exclude them because of their race in this refugee-escapee matter.

Senator WELKER. You have been a visitor to my State many times, and, as you know, we certainly have a field not only in my State but in the Northwest, there, where we could use thousands of laborers to help us in our farming operations. The only avenue we now have is the immigrant labor from Mexico and the so-called wetbacks. And the question that arose in my mind was whether, if we were to bring in from China immigrant labor of that kind, the effect would be such as to cause dissension in China.

Representative Judd. I did not understand your question that way. I thought you meant whether taking only those who would meet these qualifications would cause this reaction among the others. I do not think it would cause bitterness on the part of those who were excluded because of their failure to meet the qualifications. If it is on a basis of qualifications, I do not think there would be any resentment.

On the other hand, when you are looking, as I see on page 10,

(S. 1917) for farmworkers, the Chinese are as good farmers as ever existed in the world, willing to do the kind of thing that, as we well know, our own people do not like to do any more.

Senator WATKINS. And for the most part will not do.

Representative JUDD. That is right. So that I think consideration could well be given to the bringing in of some of these folks of this type, if they can qualify under the immigration laws.

Senator WATKINS. In your judgment, there would be not very many who could qualify?

Representative JUDD. I think that is right. Relatively, the proportion would be small.

Senator WATKINS. But, in spite of that, you think we ought to make some provision for them anyway, giving them an equality of status?

Representative JUDD. I do. Of course, I think that the percentage of literate people in this group of refugees is higher than the percentage among the general Chinese population. I mean, these refugees are mostly people of stature, or they would not have left all they have and braved all the dangers and the hazards and assumed the risks of nothing at the end, except possible starvation, in order to escape from communism. That very fact itself shows you that they are people of quality.

Senator WATKINS. Now, in a provision in the bill that might include them, would you go so far as to break it down—so many in Korea, so many Chinese, so many Japanese, and all down the line—or would you just class them as Asiatics?

Representative JUDD. I would put it: "people who are refugees or escapees" as we did in the Kersten amendment. What does it say here in the bill? It speaks of "persons who during or after World War II have left Russia or other Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Europe." Just add "or Asia." That would solve it.

Senator WATKINS. What about the Japanese?

Representative JUDD. Well, they are not refugees.

Senator WATKINS. I know they are not refugees. If we keep it strictly to a refugee problem, there might not be any offense to the Japanese.

Representative JUDD. That is right. That is my recommendation: that it ought to be kept to these folks who escape. I do not think, sir, you can handle population pressures this way.

Senator WATKINS. I realize that, and I think the President realizes it. We know this is not a solution. At best it can only be an example to other people who have far more facilities for settling people and permitting them to colonize than we have. I think that is one of the main objectives: to show to them that in this emergency we are willing to take this number of people, and in that way we are in a better position to urge them to go all out as far as they can in taking people into a country that is not yet developed.

Senator WELKER. I would like to make one observation, Doctor. I think it is fair to say that the people I represent would be much more satisfied with this bill could they be assured that they would have some people who could help us in the agricultural area, because, as you remember—I believe in 1948 we had the displaced persons. They came to our farms, and they stayed a very short time, and they soon went back to the larger cities, where their languages were spoken.

But the Chinese, in the history of our area, were pioneers in the agricultural field there, and were happy there.

Representative JUDD. And they have never caused trouble where they have been. They are not wanderers. They get a place to work, and they are happy to stay there all the rest of their lives working that soil, as they did in their homeland. I had not made bold to suggest that, but I certainly think, if the Committee and the Congress are of a mind to do it, it would be a wise thing both from the standpoint of overall foreign policy involved and the standpoint of meeting needs in this country.

Senator WELKER. It seems to me that for the vast majority of the working common people that you have in Asia, in China particularly, it would be of tremendous psychological effect to say that our people would not only grant aid to intellectuals but also to the common workman, who would have a chance to help himself and help us.

Representative JUDD. It would help enormously. The reason we started out limiting it to the intellectuals was because (1) a private organization could not take on any more than that, and (2) the intellectuals—so many of them—are the product of our own efforts, our own universities out there, and our own universities here. It does not make any sense to spend hundreds of millions of dollars through scholarships and missionary work to produce these superior people and then allow them to be destroyed or to starve to death. We are trying to save the best among those that we ourselves trained and developed, and who are completely committed, not in words but by deeds, to our side in this world struggle.

But, if we bring in some of them, even small numbers of them, it is bound to have a great effect; so that the United States is not, as the Communists would say, just capitalist colonialism and Wall Street imperialism, but interested in the laboring people, too.

Senator WELKER. I think our people would be much more interested in this bill than they are now if that were included. I shall probably talk to you further about that matter. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you, Doctor. We appreciate your coming over, and I think you have made some very helpful suggestions.

Representative JUDD. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Morse, from the Department of Agriculture, is next. The record should show that Mr. Morse is the Under Secretary of Agriculture.

You are here, I understand, to support the legislation before the committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. TRUE D. MORSE, UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. We usually ask them whether they are for or against, so that we can get this pinpointed and get right down to business.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. For the record, you may state your address. We already have your official position.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I am the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to appear before your committee to testify in support of the bill S. 1917, the Emergency Migration Act of 1953.

The administration in the United States Department of Agriculture shares the concern expressed by the President of the United States in his letter which recommended to Congress—

* * * enactment of emergency immigration legislation for the special admission of 120,000 immigrants per year for the next 2 years.

Over 40 million immigrants, in a relatively short span of years, have helped build our land from a wilderness to one of the most powerful and prosperous nations in the world. Their brains and brawn helped settle the land, advance our agriculture, build our industries, develop our commerce, produce new inventions, and in general make us a leader among the nations.

This emergency measure when enacted would be a further demonstration, by our actions, of our desire to maintain a strong defense against the threat of Communist aggressions.

Some of the agricultural considerations that prompt our support of this proposed legislation are the following:

1. There is no shortage of food in this country, and more people can be supported with high-level diets. Additions of gainfully employed people expand the markets for farm products. The primary markets for products of our farms are in the United States.

2. In section 11, item 1 of the bill, the priorities are given to—

* * * persons who are farmworkers and persons whose services or skills are needed in the United States. * * *

Record high rates of employment in the United States in recent years have caused a serious shortage of farmworkers in some of the farming areas. Therefore, there are opportunities for employment of farmworkers, provided the immigrants are effectively located within the primary farming and ranching areas.

3. The areas from which most of the immigrants would originate, as provided under the proposed legislation, have produced some of our capable farmers through immigrants of past years and their descendants. The legislation would provide for these sources of people:

(a) Escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria, 110,000.

(b) Escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey or in the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside, 15,000.

(c) Nationals of Italy or persons of Italian ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in Italy or in the Free Territory of Trieste, 75,000.

(d) Nationals of Greece or persons of Greek ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in Greece, 20,000.

(e) Nationals of the Netherlands or persons of Dutch ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in metropolitan Netherlands, 20,000.

4. With proper care exercised in the selection and placement of those admitted, there is reason to believe that an important contribution can be made to our total economy. The selections of these persons will be in the hands of American officials who will conform to all of the criteria and requirements enumerated in the present Immigra-

tion and Nationality Act for screening those who are ultimately cleared for entry. Also, those entering the United States labor force who are other than blood relatives of American residents will be admitted only when United States employers or approved sponsoring groups have given assurance of employment in fields of endeavor where the Department of Labor has certified a need for workers of particular skills.

In the event this emergency immigration legislation is enacted, the Department of Agriculture will stand ready to work with any of the immigrants that are employed in our agricultural economy.

We recommend enactment of the bill S. 1917 insofar as it affects agriculture.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Morse, there has been considerable agitation in the West, particularly in favor of agreements or extension of agreements, to bring in Mexican nationals to aid with the farmwork in the Western States. I should say specifically it is the sentiment in the Intermountain States. Now, what is the situation, if you have it in mind, with respect to the bringing in of these Mexican nationals each year? Is it a difficult operation? Do we have difficulty in getting them? And is it an expensive operation for the farmers who have to pay their transportation both ways?

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that it is difficult and is unsatisfactory.

Senator WELKER. And is very expensive?

Mr. MORSE. And expensive; yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. They are using the wetbacks a lot in the West, are they not?

Mr. MORSE. They use for seasonal labor anyone who appears ready to work.

Mr. ARENS. The Immigration Service is allegedly catching 17,000 a month out there.

Mr. MORSE. I am not aware of the figure.

Senator WATKINS. You mean they are turning back 17,000 a month?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. I think in Utah and Idaho, and possibly some of the other States, the wetbacks do not appear. Most of the Mexican nationals who come out there to help in the farmwork come under contract, entered into with the Mexican Government, and they are recruited south of the border and brought over under this contract.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. I happen to know about this, because the foremen operating some of these farms out there have had to sign up for this labor and sign up for the recruitment expenses, and provide for bringing them over, and provide for so many days of work, and that sort of thing. So, the wetback situation is of most concern, I think, along the border States, where some of them must get by, even though they turn back some 17,000 a month.

Mr. MORSE. There is still some infiltration, I understand.

Senator WATKINS. Does the Department have any figures on the need for farm laborers that could be considered on more or less a year-round basis in the United States; I mean, over and above the domestic supply of labor?

Mr. MORSE. I am not prepared to quote figures to you. I would be glad to check on what we may have available and present data for the record.

Senator WATKINS. You heard the testimony of Congressman Judd a few moments ago.

Mr. MORSE. I heard part of it, sir.

Senator WATKINS. And you heard his suggestion about the bringing in of some of the Asiatics who would be good farm laborers? I think it would be well for the committee to know just how many laborers could be absorbed on a permanent basis. Because, obviously, if they bring them over from the Far East, those people would not be going back. They would not be seasonal laborers. We would have to provide year-round work for them.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir. The answer to your question would vary with economic conditions, from year to year, and with the level of employment. As I have presented in my testimony, currently we have a very high rate of employment in the industrial centers, which means that we have a serious shortage of farm labor under these conditions. When there is less drain from the farms and rural areas into cities and industrial centers there will be more workers available on farms.

Senator WATKINS. I wonder if your Department could get us some figures on the need for permanent help for the farms of the country.

Mr. MORSE. We will give you the best we can develop.¹

Senator WATKINS. I would appreciate that very much. The question of bringing in some Asiatics will probably be considered by the committee, and it would be well to know about how many people we could take and find permanent employment for.

Mr. ARENS. There is a difference of opinion between the Department and the farm labor organizations in the West with regard to the need, is there not?

Mr. MORSE. I am not aware of the difference.

Senator WELKER. I do not follow counsel. I am on the Agriculture Committee and have heard all the testimony. I believe our farm organizations in my State realize the necessity for Mexican labor.

Mr. ARENS. I think they all realize the necessity for Mexican labor. It was the difference of opinion with respect to your permanent workers to which I had reference. And the presumption is that if people were brought in by legislation it would be for permanent employment on the farms.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. These, I am assuming, would be permanently located here in the States.

Senator WATKINS. That is what I have in mind. Because so much of the work that the Mexicans perform is seasonal. They come in to pick the fruit and do seasonal jobs on the farm. In California it is the same thing, and in the south it is the common thing to bring many of them in, in the border States, for just a summer's work, and then they go back.

Senator WELKER. Under this act, most of that would be seasonal, too, would it not?

Mr. MORSE. The number involved here we assume could be absorbed in permanent positions, certainly as long as we have high level employment.

Senator WELKER. That gets into the question in the mind of almost every Senator: What are we going to do when we do not have this

¹ Information supplied by Department of Agriculture appears at end of Mr. Morse's testimony.

high level of employment for these people? Will they be wards of the Government? Will they deprive our returning servicemen and growing up young men of work? That is the question that an opening of my mail brings to my mind.

Mr. MORSE. They will be part of the competition for positions in agriculture.

Senator WELKER. I do not think there is any question about the statement that as long as people are gainfully employed they can be used in connection with the production of farm products. But when they are not gainfully employed I cannot see such benefit. I can see only a burden on the taxpayers.

Are you familiar with this seasonal form of farmwork, as Senator Watkins brought out a while ago? In our experience in 1948 in our State with our foreign born who came here, they stayed only a short time in the rural areas, and very soon they migrated to big centers, where their language was spoken, where they had their churches, where they could mingle and visit with their own. That is another source of worry to me, as to whether or not that might happen here if we had an influx of these people to particular metropolitan areas. Do you have any observations you could give the committee on that?

Mr. MORSE. That is a definite problem. To the extent that they fill jobs in industry and in industrial centers, they take positions which otherwise would be drawing people out of the rural areas and off of farms. To the extent that they add to the labor force, whether on the farm or off the farm, it tends to lessen the pull away from the farm. Of course, the reason that we are short of labor on farms in many of these areas is the inducement to go into the cities and into industrial plants for higher wages.

Senator WELKER. I should say to you, Mr. Morse, and I am sure you are familiar with this, that in our mining areas in the State of Idaho and in other lead-, zinc-, and copper-producing areas, though not so much copper, we have a vast amount of unemployment now, due to the closure of mines in our State, and elsewhere.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And I am confronted by a tremendous volume of mail that tells me that if we bring these people in, the question arises of what chance there is for our now unemployed, who have been going without work for months, to get employed.

Mr. MORSE. With the number contemplated here, there should still be employment under present conditions, if the unemployed could be relocated where there is need for their services; and they are experienced in farm work, and willing to go into it. There is a problem where people have never performed work other than in a mine or in an industry, to try to take them on the farm. Sometimes it is a slow process to get them going effectively.

Senator WATKINS. I might observe at this point that I have had personal experience with just what you are talking about. There were something like 4,500 people in my county who were drawing unemployment compensation. And on my farm, a fruit farm, and on others in the community, we needed help and needed it badly. We went down to the employment service that handled these matters and told them of our needs, and they said, "We can get you plenty of men. We have some 4,500 unemployed."

The next morning there was not a single man who appeared to take the job. We thought something had gone wrong with the arrangements, and we asked the employment service people to repeat. And then we found through investigation that the men were not going to work outside of their own profession or their own trade, as long as they could draw workmen's compensation. They would rather take that than to go out and work on the farms.

I did finally get two transients who reported at the employment office. They came and stayed for an hour, and then we had to take them back. They decided they could not make money picking fruit at so much a bushel, although some workers had been making \$15 or \$16 a day doing the same thing.

That is an illustration of what we are talking about. That has happened in numerous places. We just cannot get people who have training in other occupations, as long as there is some unemployment compensation given them, to go to the farms and do the laborious and tiring farm jobs.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir. I fully realize what you are talking about; it is their willingness to do farm work as well as their experience.

Senator WELKER. If our native born are not willing to do farm work, I wonder what experience we will have with these 240,000 people, whether they will be willing to do farmwork or any other work. It seems to me quite a gamble. That is the problem we are confronted with in immigration. At all times that is true.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir. I am assuming, as indicated in my statement, that the selection of these people would be carefully done, and that they would be properly located in this country. Unless both of those were observed, it could add to the problems.

Senator WELKER. We were told that the selection of those people in 1948 would be carefully done, carefully handled, and that they would be properly located, too, but I do not think it worked out that way, at least in the areas I represent.

Senator WATKINS. Now, with reference to the Asiatics, Dr. Judd, ahead of you, testified that in his opinion there would not be more than 5 or 6 thousand Asiatics who could qualify. Do you think probably we could find work for that many Asiatics, if they were all willing to work on farms and do the kind of work our people do not want to do? I do not say that our people would not do it eventually if they got to the point where they had to do it, but they do not want to do it. Our young people from the high schools and colleges nowadays do not go out on the fruit farms and on the other farms in the summer like they used to. We have industrialization in Utah to quite a large extent, and they all look for jobs in industry, rather than getting out on the fruit farms, even though the compensation is fairly good on these farms.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir. There will be a continuing need for these people. They are willing to do the manual labor that is needed on the farms, fruit farms and vegetable farms. That will be true especially if Asiatics are admitted under the program.

Senator WATKINS. Some interesting things have developed in this country under our high standard of living. The Japanese, who do farming in our State, are regarded as some of the very best farmers. If you can get them to come and work for you on your farm, even at odd times, they are the very finest of workers.

During the war, when the Japanese from the coast were relocated at the very large camp at Topaz, many of the nearby farmers were desperate for help, so they hired Japanese boys from the coast. These boys had been born in this country, and of course they had gone to American schools, and were just as much at home as any of the white children whose parents had been here for a long time. They put some of those boys on the farms to work, but they did not have any more desire to work than did their white friends. It was about the same result. It shows how the standard of living changes points of view.

That is a real problem with any farm operation that requires hand labor. It is getting to be one of the toughest problems our farmers have. Many of them are going out of business because they cannot get that kind of labor.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir. One or two generations gets them into mechanization and of a mind to get away from the manual labor part of farming very rapidly, as we all know.

Senator WELKER. Then, when they get away from that, they go with their skills to the factories in the larger cities, and it is reasonable to assume that at some time we might have mass unemployment there. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, sir. However, to the extent that we have partial unemployment it tends to stem the flow from rural areas into the cities, and as a result leaves more workers in the rural areas. And if conditions should get bad enough, with mass unemployment, after a lapse of time, there is a reversal of the flow and people go out into rural areas and attempt to get employment to maintain themselves and their families.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. We appreciate your statement.

Mr. MORSE. Thank you.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT FROM DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ON NEED FOR YEAR-ROUND FARM WORKERS

There has long been a downward trend in farm employment. Average annual employment—family and hired—dropped from 11.7 million in 1940 to 9.8 million in 1952. During the past decade acute farm labor shortages have accompanied this decline necessitating the importation of foreign and offshore workers for temporary employment in seasonal and regular farm jobs. Despite these temporary programs and accelerated tempo of recruiting activities by the United States and State Employment Services, demands for regular or year-round type workers have not been met, particularly for dairy workers, general farm hands, ranch hands, and farm couples.

Continuing high level economic activities in the foreseeable future will draw additional manpower from the farm work force. During 1952 information from USDA field offices reflected concern about the supply of regular-type farm manpower in about half the States. Reports early in 1953 indicate that this had spread to about three-fourths of the States. Census Bureau reports that one-third of the persons employed in agriculture during the survey week in mid-March 1953 were working 60 to 90 hours.

The Department of Labor determines and certifies as to the need for out-of-country workers to supplement available domestic workers. Secretary Durkin in testifying before your committee referred to estimates of needs for regular workers as high as 200,000. Based on the general economic conditions, as discussed above, agriculture can absorb more than its proportionate share of the net addition to the labor force accruing from the admission of 240,000 additional immigrants in the next 2 years.

Senator WATKINS. Dr. Van Kirk is next. I notice he has with him, Mr. Roland Elliott and Dr. Clarence Crumbholz, all from the National Council of Churches and the Church World Service.

STATEMENTS OF WALTER W. VAN KIRK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND GOODWILL OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N. Y.; A. ROLAND ELLIOTT, CHURCH WORLD SERVICE, NEW YORK, N. Y.; AND CLARENCE E. CRUMBHOLZ, NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Dr. VAN KIRK. And the National Lutheran Council, Dr. Crumbholz.

Senator WATKINS. The record will so show.

Which one wishes to speak first?

Dr. VAN KIRK. I will.

Senator WATKINS. Will you give your full name, your address, and your profession? We want that for the record.

Dr. VAN KIRK. I can read this in about 6 or 7 minutes, and I want to hake an oral statement in addition.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Walter W. Van Kirk of New York City. I am the executive director of the department of international justice and goodwill of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. I appear before you by authorization of the general board of the National Council of Churches and of the executive director of the National Lutheran Council.

The National Council of Churches is comprised of 30 Protestant and Orthodox communions having a total membership of more than 34 million. The National Lutheran Council represents eight participating bodies of the Lutheran Church in this country. I cannot, obviously, speak for each of the members of theses churches. I can assure you, however, that there is strong support among the communions related to the National Council of Churches and the bodies related to the National Lutheran Council for emergency legislation for the relief of refugees.

The general assembly of the National Council of Churches, in session in Denver in December 1952, expressed its sympathy and concern respecting the plight of the millions of uprooted people who cannot return to their own countries and who are unable to find homes and work in the countries of their refuge. This situation was described as "tragic with suffering for the individual," and as "an important factor in the worldwide unrest." The general assembly of the National Council of Churches then called for "immediate special legislation to permit and assist our fair share of the refugees to enter the United States for permanent residence." The executive committee of the National Lutheran Council, on March 25, 1953, voted unanimously in support of emergency legislation for refugees.

In view of these actions the people of our churches rejoiced when, on April 22, 1953, President Eisenhower called for such legislation. The general board of the National Council of Churches in session in Chicago, may 20, 1953, took note of President Eisenhower's request and, without a dissenting vote, recommended that Congress approve

such legislation at the earliest possible moment. Similar expressions of approval of the President's action have been forthcoming from the leaders of the National Lutheran Council.

In carrying out the recommendations of the President we feel sure the Congress will wish to make certain that the 240,000 visas proposed are used in a way that will bring the largest measure of relief to the problem of overpopulation, composed as it is of refugees and escapees on the one hand and of nationals on the other. There is a growing recognition, we believe, that 240,000 visas spread over the combined problems of surplus populations and refugees will not vitally affect either problem—whereas 240,000 visas utilized for refugees and escapees can, in fact, provide the impetus to a real resolution of many of the most difficult concentrations of the refugee problem—and thus constitute the most effective and strategic contribution to the problem of overpopulation.

Mr. ARENS. Then is it the position of the National Council of Churches and of yourself and of your colleagues that the legislation should be devoted exclusively to refugees as distinguished from the overpopulation problem?

Dr. VAN KIRK. That is our position, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Then you take issue with about 50 percent of the bill, which is devoted to overpopulation?

Senator WATKINS. I think that is not quite fair in its interpretation, because it was indicated yesterday by the witnesses who testified that it was the intent to take care of, for instance, in Italy, the 75,000 of those refugees who came in from the Italian colonies who were forced back from Ethiopia and northern Africa.

Dr. VAN KIRK. Insofar as provisions for the relief of refugees become operative, to that degree they do tend to relax the pressures with respect to population in their respective countries.

Mr. ARENS. To make the record absolutely clear, is it your position, the position of the National Council of Churches of Christ and the National Lutheran Council, that the bill should be changed so that the 240,000 will be available exclusively to people in the refugee category?

Dr. VAN KIRK. That would be our desire, sir.

To include repatriates and returnees in Greece and Italy in a refugee bill would constitute real relief to the overpopulation problems in these countries. Such provision on a fair and proportionate basis in a refugee bill we would strongly advocate.

We use the term "refugees" to include those people who have been uprooted from their homes by war and the aftermath of war; the German expellees residing in Western Germany and Austria; the Italian returnees, the Greek expellees now residing in Greece; the escapees from Iron Curtain countries; and European refugees in the Middle East and elsewhere. We believe legislation should be enacted to permit the entrance into the United States, on a nonquota basis, of a specified number of these persons. The number proposed by the President—120,000 per year, for 2 years—seems to us to be a fair, just, and practicable contribution by the United States to the solution of the refugee problem. Action by the Congress along these lines would receive, in our view, the overwhelming support of the people of our churches.

We believe such action would vastly increase the moral and spiritual stature of the United States. By admitting its fair share of these homeless and destitute persons the United States would stand before the world as the deliverer of the oppressed and the defender of those who, at the risk of their lives, have sought release from the bondage of Communist oppression. Such action would invest our foreign policy with the quality of mercy and correct the misimpression of those who believe the United States is indifferent to the plight of these helpless people.

The National Council of Churches and the National Lutheran Council believe the refugee problem, tragic enough in itself, is contributing to the worldwide unrest by which our own peace and security are threatened. Accordingly, by helping the refugees we help ourselves. By defending the right of the refugees to life and liberty we earn for ourselves the respect of the freedom-loving nations of the earth. Our security is thereby enhanced since our defense is more than a matter of guns and bombs, and armed forces. We need and must have the goodwill and sympathetic understanding of the free peoples of the world. The enactment of refugee legislation would strengthen the bonds of friendship between ourselves and those nations which stand with us in resisting the advance of Communist aggression.

We are reluctant to make recommendations as to the categories and the number of refugees in each of these categories that should be included in the pending legislation. No official action has been taken by our bodies on this specific matter. However, for such value as it may have, we append herewith a suggested table of categories of refugees for the guidance of the committee. We have every reason to believe the Congress will wish to deal with these categories on the basis of need and without regard to sectarian, racial, or geographical considerations.

If and when the Congress adopts special legislation for refugees, the National Council of Churches believes that no further legislation of an emergency character should be enacted. We do not believe that migration problems related to surplus populations, as such, should be dealt with on a piecemeal and emergency basis. Nor does the National Council of Churches or the National Lutheran Council believe that the United States or any other nation, acting separately, can solve the many complex issues relating to surplus population. The migration and resettlement of these people is a world problem and should be dealt with on a world basis. We would welcome a review of this entire matter by the United Nations, for example, and, with the moral and material assistance of our own and other governments, the creation of such international machinery as would be competent to deal with this world issue in a world manner.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with S. 1766, which creates this Office of the Commissioner of Refugees?

Dr. VAN KIRK. No, but I think my colleague, Mr. Elliott, would be prepared to answer inquiries you make with regard to that.

But before we come to that, may I add this additional statement to this formal statement, that we have not expressed any judgment in this statement with regard to the provisions in the legislation before this committee that have to deal with the administration of this act should it become law. But both of my colleagues, Dr. Crumholz and Dr. Elliott, have had considerable experience in the field of operation

with respect to the former DP legislation. And if, out of their experience, they have suggestions and points of view that would be helpful to the committee in the area of operation and administration, they would be available to the committee for consultation and would be prepared to answer inquiries with regard to those specific matters at this hearing this morning.

Mr. ARENS. May I say I have known Mr. Elliott for many years, and in my experience in this field I have found him to be thoroughly reliable and thoroughly experienced and thoroughly conversant with the many facets of this field. I am sure the committee would be interested in his observations.

Dr. VAN KIRK. May I then ask that there be included in the hearings this supplementary paper, in which observations are made with regard to problems of administration.

Senator WATKINS. It may be received.

(The material referred to appears at the conclusion of the testimony given by the representatives of the church councils.)

Senator WATKINS. I notice that you apparently have carried through your theory of only taking care of refugees, and you have 35,000 for the Italian allotment.

Dr. VAN KIRK. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. That is based on an estimate of a total of 500,000 Italian refugees?

Dr. VAN KIRK. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. For the Greeks, you have a total estimate of 174,000 refugees, and their quota allotment under your view would be 12,000.

Dr. VAN KIRK. That would seem to us to be fair.

Senator WATKINS. That varies from the terms of the bill, but there is nothing sacred about the provisions of the bill itself. That is to get something before us that we can talk about.

Dr. VAN KIRK. There is nothing sacred about this table which we submit also, but it would seem to us to represent a fair and proportionate allocation of numbers.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have a ratio there, Doctor? We have here what we have compiled as the statistical study, just the so-called statistics.

I wonder if you have the ratio of the numbers you have set up here in any proportion to the numbers actually in the various areas.

Dr. VAN KIRK. Would you wish to speak to that, Dr. Elliott?

Dr. ELLIOTT. It is a very approximate slide rule, Senator, that we have applied to this problem, because at so many points, the problem itself is not the total number, for example, the 8,500,000 under the second or "b" category, but it is the number of those who have not yet found it possible to be assimilated in the economy in which they are living. Consequently, our right-hand column is a very approximate "guesstimate" on what we believe would constitute real relief to the remaining fraction of the total problem that is involved in that particular category.

Senator WATKINS. For the record, I think we had better have your name and your address.

Dr. ELLIOTT. Roland Elliott, Church World Service, 120 East 23d Street, New York City.

Senator WATKINS. And the other gentleman?

Dr. CRUMBHOLZ. Clarence Crumbholz, National Lutheran Council, 50 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. ARENS. Could you supply the committee with the estimate that you have of the number in each of the various areas, just your plain statistics, who ought to be migrated? You see, you do not propose that this takes care of everybody.

Dr. ELLIOTT. Yes. We can do that.

Mr. ARENS. I think it would be helpful to the committee, so that we can see what is the key or the formula that you used to work out your overall recommendations.

Dr. ELLIOTT. We can do that, yes.

Senator WATKINS. Senator Welker, any questions?

Senator WELKER. Dr. Van Kirk, did you hear the testimony of Dr. Judd this morning?

Dr. VAN KIRK. Yes, I did, Senator.

Senator WELKER. I notice that in "h" of your statement, you recommend that 5,000 European refugees from China and Manchuria be admitted. Now, could that not have a very bad effect on the psychological attempts we are making in China and in the Far East, when it is portrayed to them by the Communists that we are coming over into China and Manchuria and accepting Europeans and not accepting Chinese?

Dr. VAN KIRK. I think that while no official action has been taken by our bodies on the proposal submitted by Congressman Judd, we would be agreeable to a reasonable number of Asians of the type described by Congressman Judd to be included within the legislation. That is my own personal opinion. I am not speaking now officially on behalf of the National Council.

I should say that our point of view with regard to the bearing of the relief of refugees on the problem of overpopulation is reinforced in the case of Greece particularly by a communication from the Committee for Interchurch Aid and Foreign Relations of the Church in Greece. We have received from this body, over the signature of Mr. Alivisatos, the general secretary of this organization, the following communication addressed to Mr. Elliott:

Visiting this country I have been greatly gladdened to find the strong friendship for my country and the desire to be of assistance to us.

I have noted recently your President's message calling for what he well called emergency legislation to enable 240,000 refugees and others in special need to emigrate to the United States of America. This would be a great act of generous help to us since the present American quota is far too small to meet our present needs.

In my judgment, as I told you, the very best way to help Greece through this special legislation proposed by your President would be to include as many visas as possible for Greek refugees and repatriates now resident in Greece. These persons naturally constitute the most serious aspect of our population problems and include some of our best families and workers.

I cite this communication by way of reinforcing the point which I tried to make in my formal statement that by providing the greatest possible relief for refugees and repatriates as such, you make an indirect, albeit a more effective contribution to the problem of surplus populations.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Elliott, do you have any observations you would like to make with reference to the latter part of the doctor's statement on the overall approach to the whole worldwide problem of refugees, which is suggested by S. 1766, another bill?

Dr. ELLIOTT. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that your two bills work together admirably with regard to the total problem that is most acutely before us in connection with the general population problem in the world. The bill, S. 1766, which would combine in one office and one administration our total governmental interest in the field of refugees, is compatible with the program which would involve the participation of the United States in offering sanctuary through immigration to as large a number as is consistent with our national policy here. It is my own view, and this is not an official view on behalf of our agencies, but I have been rather close to both of these problems and naturally have been watching the suggestions that have been made, is that the twin approach, of increasing the coordination and the effectiveness within our own Government, and the international outreach of our Government's policy with respect to the total refugee problem, is from the standpoint of statesmanship and leadership on the part of America the most strategic thing that, in my judgment, under the present circumstances, can be done.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you this, Mr. Elliott: On the basis of your considerable experience here, both in the old displaced persons program and in the current problem, do you have any suggestions to make with reference to the definitions in here, the classes embraced?

I invite your attention specifically to section 2 of the bill, where the definition of "escapees" appears, and of "German expellee."

Dr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any suggestions to make? And if you have not, I would like to suggest that you think about it and see if you could not help the committee on any of those.

Dr. ELLIOTT. I haven't any at the moment. I think they are very good.

Senator WATKINS. With respect to the bill providing for a Director of Refugees and the combining of our activities under one head, I think you have in mind the fact that there are now some 10 agencies dealing with European refugee problems alone. We are contributing the entire financial support or a part of it, and it certainly would be desirable to put them under one head and not have them competing with each other.

Dr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. Information has come to me to the effect that these agencies have been actually competing with each other, and some refugees are actually holding out to see who will give them the best offer.

Dr. ELLIOTT. I think we are in a somewhat embarrassing position, because we receive very fine cooperation from a number of those agencies included in the 10 that you mentioned, and we would like to express our gratitude for this, and we would like to see it continued.

At the same time, being as close to the actual overseas operation of these programs as we are, we can see that it would be of very great benefit to have the kind of coordination that is called for.

Senator WATKINS. I am convinced that there is no doubt about the need for consolidation of our activities, so that there will not be duplications and waste and sometimes extravagance in our operations over there. The load is heavy enough, but we could do more with the same money if it were spent wisely and under one head, I think.

Dr. ELLIOTT. But with the representative of the escapee program, for example, in the room at the time, I would like him to understand how greatly we appreciate their cooperation and how much we are anxious to have it continued.

Senator WATKINS. We want the cooperation of all these agencies that are not directly under the control of the United States. Their cooperation can be there. But as far as the direction of what this country is to do itself, officially, it should be done under one head. That is the purpose of the bill to provide for a Director of Refugees, to place it under one division of Government.

Of course, that American help will go much further if it is not wasted. The same money will do a lot more. And I am sure the people will all appreciate having it go much further. It is going to be a problem to get the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds, unless we do make a showing that they are being wisely expended and are not being wasted.

We appreciate your comments on this other legislation. It is not directly before us here, but I think possibly before we get through with this, the committee may consider the possibility of combining the two bills, or at least having combining measures, so that we can have a constructive approach in addition to just the taking of these people in.

Dr. ELLIOTT. It would seem to us that such a move to do a thorough and comprehensive piece of legislating with respect to the total relation of the United States Government to the refugee problem both here and in its outreach would be the effective thing to do.

Mr. ARENS. Dr. Elliott, I would like to suggest it would be helpful to the committee if you could personally study these various definitions of refugees and give your assistance on them. I know that in a number of governments no two have the same definition of a refugee. If you could give a little thought to that and on the basis of your experience make suggestions, I am sure it would be helpful to the committee.

Dr. ELLIOTT. I think one other thing we might comment on is pointing up a little of what Dr. Van Kirk has said, about our experience and therefore perhaps our ability to help a little in relation to the method of selections and the methods of assurances and placement, and so on. I think that in general our experience, especially toward the latter part of the displaced persons program, was that the blanket assurance approach obviated certain difficulties that we had earlier. We found, I think in common with all of the agencies and with the DP Commission itself, that it was exceedingly problematical to attempt to take an assurance for, let us say, a farm job or any other job, in Kansas, and to go overseas and to select a man, with his family, that would fit into that job, three to four thousand miles away, and make a placement, and then to enforce it by requiring a good-faith oath that the man would abide by the conditions of his employment on a permanent basis. We found that it was much sounder and more stable to proceed on the basis, as we did later, of selecting people who would be good workers and, in our judgment, good Americans, and then to begin, when they were visaed, to actually commence the process of placement and the requiring of assurances with regard to their good faith.

Senator WELKER. What assurances, Doctor, could you demand and require of these refugees as to their good faith? I am interested in that.

Dr. ELLIOTT. I think that it can be made a general requirement, Senator, not specifically attached to a particular job about which the man signing the good-faith oath knows very little; that it would be far better to have a general statement of good intention with regard to his coming to America for a serious purpose and for cooperating in the kind of placement that will make it possible for him and his family to become self-sustaining individuals in this country.

Mr. ARENS. That did not mean a thing in the DP program, though, did it, the statement they had there?

Dr. ELLIOTT. Well, I don't think that this specific placement of people for specific jobs meant too much either.

Mr. ARENS. It did not mean a thing. They didn't deport one individual for violation of his contract to work, although there were hundreds of known cases of violations. Is that not true?

Dr. ELLIOTT. Also, under the farm priority, there was a tendency, a natural tendency, on the part of all of the DP's, to pull out of their background any experience that would justify them coming in under the agricultural priority. And we very soon discovered that the farm experience in eastern Europe was a very different thing from farm requirements in Wisconsin or Illinois.

Dr. CRUMBHOLZ. Our experience, however, Mr. Chairman, was that many of the DP's were very conscientious about fulfilling their promises to stay at least a year in their first placement. As a matter of fact, we have lately made a sample study of some 700 of the 36,000 that our organization brought in, and we looked at 50 for the first year and another 50 for the second year, and so forth, just picked out from the files at random, and we discovered that more than half of this number that were studied were still, at the time of the study, in their first placement. That may be significant to you or it may not be. But time after time, these people who had promised to go onto farms stayed on the farms, because they felt that they had a responsibility to the sponsor, for at least a year or more, even if they felt that they could make their contribution to American life in some different field.

Senator WELKER. I just wanted to ask the doctor on the end there: Under this act, what relief could we have if the refugee did violate his oath, or his good-intention clause, that we were discussing a moment ago?

Dr. ELLIOTT. I would not object to applying the proposed penalties with respect to that.

Senator WELKER. Well, we could not send him back, could we?

Dr. ELLIOTT. Well, I personally feel that the answer to that question, Senator Welker, is in good selection in the first place, to make sure of the people we are getting, and that there is enough total to select what is really the minority on a very rigid basis, that would mean that we would get the best people, which I think is the best guaranty that we can get. And what Mr. Arens has said about the fact that we have not, so far as I know, deported a single person for either security reasons—

Mr. ARENS. They have had 2,000 warrants out on subversive and criminal activities of all kinds.

Dr. ELLIOTT. Of course, some of those are just investigational warrants, are they not?

Mr. ARENS. That is right.

Dr. ELLIOTT. But not one single person has been deported out of that number.

Mr. ARENS. That DP program in that respect was atrocious. You ought to read the report.

Senator WELKER. What happened to it?

Mr. ARENS. The full Judiciary Committee came out with a report, approved unanimously, to the effect that there was a complete breakdown in the administration of it. That is the trouble here. We have to be very cautious on anything of this character.

Senator WELKER. How many in the 1948 act?

Mr. ARENS. Altogether we brought in over 400,000, close to 500,000, including the German ethnics.

Dr. ELLIOTT. But the 2,000 does not mean that those cases have been proved, does it?

Mr. ARENS. No.

Senator WELKER. Well, you do not issue warrants just for the fun of it. They must have some evidence.

Dr. ELLIOTT. Oh, yes, of course.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you this: On the basis of your background and experience there, Mr. Elliott, do most of these people have documentation now which would, under the Immigration and Nationality Act, entitle them, if they were otherwise eligible for a visa, to come into the country? Do they have passports, documents of identification?

Dr. ELLIOTT. I think in the largest percentage, yes. You are speaking about those in Europe, now?

Mr. ARENS. Yes. I know in the DP program there was just wholesale fraud on documentation, and the thought occurred to me of the prospect of, in certain types of cases, waiving documentation, so that you just would not open up the door to all the fraud, and have some kind of certification of identity by some agency of the Government. What would you think about that?

Dr. ELLIOTT. I think it would probably be the better thing to do. Because documentation, we know, was in the early days, especially, of the DP program, a matter of manufacture in some cases.

Senator WATKINS. That was because of the failure of the administrators to enforce the act.

Dr. ELLIOTT. It was also, Senator, a reflection of the terrific turmoil and tragedy out of which people had come, and their desire to escape, and their experience previously in finding that any kind of paper that they could lay their hands on was a possible way to remain alive. But I do not think that we have that type of situation.

Senator WATKINS. That pressure is off now, is it not, to a large extent?

Dr. ELLIOTT. I don't know about those coming in through Berlin recently.

Senator WATKINS. Well, as a matter of fact, our information is that we do not have very many in camps now, in displaced persons camps or refugee camps. They have been absorbed fairly well in the economy.

Mr. ARENS. There have been about 400,000 actually in camps, but a lot of those are not in the refugee category.

Dr. ELLIOTT, let me ask you this: What would you gentlemen think of a provision to the effect that any doubt on the security phase would be resolved against the applicant? Even a doubt. Now, it would be pretty harsh in individual cases, obviously. What do you think about that?

Dr. ELLIOTT. I think we are dealing in large enough numbers so that it will be possible to give relief to the numbers that this law would call for.

Mr. ARENS. I know the security officers told us in certain categories 40 percent right now are in the criminal and subversive categories, exclusive of those coming into Berlin. When you deal with a group of that type, you have got to be exceedingly cautious.

Do you think that there would be general acceptance of a program and of legislation which would provide that any doubt would be resolved against the applicant and in favor of the security of this country?

Dr. ELLIOTT. Well, Dr. Van Kirk, maybe you would like to speak to that.

My own answer to that would be that we are not here to ask for any modification of the strictest security measures with respect to definite subversion.

Mr. ARENS. I wasn't in any sense suggesting that you were.

Senator WELKER. That is going a long way, Counsel. "Doubt" is a broad term. I appreciate the reasons why you brought it up. But we can get into lots of doubt on that score. "Reasonable doubt" would sound better.

But then we are led to this conclusion, Mr. Chairman. How are we going to get over there and investigate where these refugees came from, their backgrounds, as to what they did, whether or not they were subversive, whether or not they took part in persecution behind the Iron Curtain? It seems to me that is one of our hardest problems. Would you agree with me, Doctor, on that?

Mr. ARENS. That is the hardest part we were confronted with in Europe this last summer, when the Intelligence agencies told us that 40 percent of them are in the subversive and criminal category.

In one area they had 40 espionage cases; just in 1 area.

Senator WATKINS. They must obviously have had some records in order to find the 40 percent.

Mr. ARENS. Yes. We asked them about the other 60 percent, and they said they were just blind on them.

Senator WATKINS. Where did they obtain the information? I think the problem Senator Welker is pointing up is: How are we going to get behind the Iron Curtain and find out what these people did before they became escapees or expellees?

Dr. ELLIOTT. It is a very difficult problem, I certainly would say. My own feeling is that we need competent people to do the screening far more than we need precise definitions with regard to, well such things as criminality. What is criminality? It may be that the criminality that would be interpreted as being exclusionary would be the kind of criminality that would be a part of a person's necessity to survive or escape. For example, we have a case now on Ellis

Island being detained under the requirement of the DP law, where a man, because of early experience in Rumania, is excludable. But following that experience, he served in three Nazi concentration camps in Germany. So that what I am saying is that we need a certain amount of resiliency and personal judgment in this area as well as strict definitions.

Senator WATKINS. Well, it is almost impossible in dealing with human beings to adopt strict, rigid rules that will apply to every case, and render justice in each case.

Dr. ELLIOTT. But that is not to say that we want sloppy screening.

Senator WATKINS. Oh, no. I am personally in favor of very careful screening.

Senator WELKER. That leads me to this observation, Mr. Chairman. Without the background and the whole history of the individual, unless we have some agents that have brought us information from beyond the Iron Curtain, I just do not see how you are going to get that proper agency who can, without the history of the applicant, give us the true story.

Now, I have come here and have served, as the chairman has, on the Internal Security Subcommittee. In the case of some people who were admitted Communists or ex-Communists, I was impressed with how little I know of human nature. Because not one of those people would I ever suspect. And when they want to give you a story, they can certainly fool me. And I have had a little bit of experience in the trial of lawsuits and judging human nature. It is a substantial, a terrific problem.

Mr. ARENS. It was for that reason I was suggesting your inquiring of the gentlemen, based on their experience, what their attitude would be on language in an act which would resolve any doubt. And there are all types of cases in which there are fragmentary bits of information. Even though in the individual case it would be a hardship, something none of us would want in an individual case, yet from the standpoint of an overall program and the standpoint of the security interests of this Nation, we would still be receiving a number, and for that number we would have the maximum reasonable assurance of security. What do you think about that?

Senator WATKINS. Let me suggest this, Mr. Arens. Or let me ask you this. You are very well acquainted with the 1952 act.

Does not that act set up various strong standards for screening? Because we have the same problem to a certain extent in the regular immigration program. As I understand it, it does set up some very exacting standards.

Mr. ARENS. But the difference is this, and it is a very material difference: In the regular immigration case, you have a man who is a long-time resident of the area in which he applies for a visa. The police records are available. His neighbors can be interrogated. His reputation is known in the community. In this particular group you are dealing with people whose background information is just not available to the intelligence agencies, except after months of investigation and much coincidence of information from informers. That is just precisely what the intelligence agencies told us when we were over there last summer. They said it takes months and months. In some cases they are clear on the situation right away. They know they are all right. They have informers that tell them about the case.

Others they are doubtful about. And in some cases, they have very serious information. Some people inform on others. They will say, "Yes, I was in such and such a village in Czechoslovakia. But this man I see over here is an agent." And the intelligence agencies told us that except in those cases of people coming into Berlin, 40 percent of those coming across from behind the Iron Curtain are in the criminal and subversive categories.

They said, "You cannot get through unless you are very adept, through the barbed wire and the mines and the dogs and the watch-towers and all that."

We said, "What about the other 60 percent?" And they said, "We are blind on that. Some of them we know are all right."

And that, from my standpoint, as one who has been deeply concerned with this problem, is basic on this point.

Dr. ELLIOTT. That wouldn't apply to the escapees through Berlin, would it?

Mr. ARENS. Through Berlin they say it is a different situation. It is altogether different. The situation is different in Italy on the former nationals returned from the colonies. That is different. But respecting your Iron Curtain escapees, the intelligence agencies are frankly puzzled.

Dr. ELLIOTT. The experience that some have had overseas is that the best screening was done by the FBI within the camp—the people who knew and who could follow through on rumors and help sift them down themselves.

Mr. ARENS. In 1 camp they had 40 espionage cases—right there in 1 camp—and those are espionage cases.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, may I make one short observation? On counsel's question to the doctor with respect to his approval of the doubt feature, it seems to me that if we had a smooth Communist in one of these camps, such a regulation would absolutely eradicate this whole act. Because if a smooth Communist got by our investigators, our screening people, he could just drop a little hint to our agents that "That man over there"—probably one of the most loyal persons in the camp—"is actually a Communist agent." That would certainly raise a doubt, and, therefore, a Communist could obliterate, by his activity under the doubt suggestion, our hope of getting loyal, good people here. That is just an observation for what it is worth.

Senator WATKINS. I think we will have to give considerable study to the suggestions made by Mr. Arens and I think the comment of Senator Welker is very well taken.

I think this, however: that we are bound to make some mistakes on this and we have not done here in the United States all that is necessary, where we have had all the records of these people. They have apparently infiltrated into the Government itself to the very highest circles. We are still trying to dig them out. So if we have only had 2,000 cases out of the number of people that came over, we did about as well as we did in keeping them out of the Government.

Senator WELKER. I think better.

Dr. ELLIOTT. I think general principles and good judgment would be the important things and to know what it is we are really trying to do.

Mr. ARENS. I am not at all suggesting that you or anyone is advocating the admission into the country of Communists.

Dr. ELLIOTT. We know that.

Mr. ARENS. Our interest is how to detect them and how to screen them out.

Senator WATKINS. We want to make it as securityproof as possible and still try to accomplish some of the purposes of the bill.

Dr. ELLIOTT. Could we make one other comment?

May I say that those who have looked into the loan provisions doubt whether it is quite adequate.

Senator WATKINS. What do you mean by "adequate"? Do you think we ought to do more than loan them money for their transportation and their fees? Of course, fees are all waived, as I understand, under this bill.

Dr. CRUMBHOLZ. If this loan fund is to provide for overseas transportation, in addition to inland transportation, at that point we have our serious doubts whether it is large enough.

Mr. ARENS. Inland transportation would keep them away from the big cities, would it not, or at least give an incentive to have them taken out to the rural communities? We had that problem in the DP legislation.

Senator WATKINS. I had a suggestion only yesterday from one Senator who has been studying this subject to a considerable extent. He said that one of our big problems in the United States is going to be the concentration of population, particularly if we have war, in the big cities, and he wonders if it would be possible and feasible to work out a provision that these people could be distributed over the United States and for a period of years would have to stay where they were allocated. I mean at least in the State or the region rather than just as soon as they go to the farms and fulfill a part of the agreement, then immediately go back to a big city and increase the problems that we have there. I do not know whether that is feasible or not, but I thought it was worthwhile thinking about.

Dr. ELLIOTT. The financial provision is very closely related to that problem, which is from our standpoint very important, to get these people distributed.

Senator WELKER. Doctor, I want to say this to you, that if it is possible for me to get to these camps over in Europe and see them with my own eyes, I think it will be rewarding. Not that I have any ability any greater than any other human being. But since I have never been to Europe, I do not know this subject matter and do not know the problem. I expect to pay my own way and get over there and see this. I think that would be helpful. Because it is so hard for us who have never seen this matter and never made a study of it to come up with anything concrete. I expect to do that, and I hope you people will suggest it is a good idea, because I have to convince my wife of the necessity.

Dr. ELLIOTT. We would be glad to facilitate the contacts.

Senator WATKINS. I think the committee is contemplating, as soon as we get through the rest of this particular session, to make a trip over, so that the members can check on these matters. But it is going to be impossible from my point of view for us to check on all the conditions in the localities that are involved before we pass legislation. If we had to do that, we probably never would get through.

I share with Senator Welker the desire to go over. I have never been over there either, although members of my family have been and have spent some time over there, spending 6 years studying cultures and languages. It may not be possible for all of us to go, but I would not like to discourage anyone if he wants to go.

Are there any further questions?

Thank you, gentlemen.

(Following are the CWS-NLC proposals re special emergency refugee legislation.)

CWS-NLC PROPOSALS RE SPECIAL EMERGENCY REFUGEE LEGISLATION

1. Limit special legislation to refugees who as a result of World War II or its aftermath cannot return to their homelands or are fugitives from communism and who cannot be absorbed in the country of their present residence.

(Normal citizens in countries of overpopulation should not be included. To do so would in fact be a modification of the quota system and would invite opposition as such; it would weaken the humanitarian and foreign-policy appeal of refugees, it would complicate and jeopardize the entire program by inviting pressures of a considerable list of nationality groups and it is unnecessary since immigration opportunities for refugees (e. g., Italian expellees from colonies) will reduce overpopulation pressures in these countries as substantially as would be possible even if special legislation were to include normal residents.)

2. The numbers proposed by the President—120,000 per year for 2 years—in our judgment is a practicable and substantial and fair-share contribution by America to the solution of the refugee problem.

3. We believe the following categories of refugees should be included in special legislation:

	Estimated total	240,000 to United States
(a) IRO refugees (DP's) and expellees especially to provide for "pipeline" cases and for reunion of families.....	180,000	35,000
(b) German expellees residing in Western Germany and Austria (Volksdeutsche).....	8,500,000	95,000
(c) Assistance on Italian overpopulation by including Italian returnees expelled from colonies (Venezia Giulia) now resident within Italy.....	500,000	35,000
(d) Assistance on Greek overpopulation by including Greek expellees now residing in Greece.....	174,000	12,000
(e) Neorefugees from Iron Curtain countries and East Zone of Germany.....	2,000,000	35,000
(f) Refugees residing in NATO and other countries of the free world.....	200,000	20,000
(g) European refugees in Middle East.....	6,000	2,000
(h) European refugees in China and Manchuria.....	25,000	5,000
(i) Orphans.....	(?)	1,000

4. On the basis of our experience in the DP program, we would urge the importance of providing in this special legislation for the following administrative principles and procedures.

(a) Fullest integration with intergovernmental programs looking toward cooperation of other governments in similar efforts to resolve the refugee problem.

(b) Administration of the special immigration program can be greatly simplified and made more effective by placing responsibility for it within the regular consular service (with such augmentation of personnel as may be required) and within the Immigration and Naturalization Service, with a qualified coordinating and expediting officer within the State Department.

(c) The functions of voluntary agencies should be solely complementary to the governmental program, with the Government being directly responsible for all administrative aspects of the program. Voluntary agencies can cooperate in providing individual or "blanket" assurances, in working for sound resettlement in communities and in rendering other services consistent with their purposes. In order to facilitate coordination and effectiveness of the program, it is suggested that a limited number of major voluntary agencies be designated by the Government to participate in the program and to represent related nationality and similar organizations.

(d) To obviate the dangers of long-distance placement and to provide for more adequate and stable local placement, it is recommended that overseas selections be made general with actual placements to be made following occupational analyses, counseling, orientation, and English instruction. Good-faith oaths should be required at the time of actual placement.

(e) The Government program itself should incorporate such operating procedures and the utilization of social agencies as will help to maintain family unity, and provide humanitarian services for family members requiring special care or needing rehabilitation assistance. These humanitarian provisions should be integral to the governmental program without financial guaranties or bonds required of the voluntary agencies.

(f) To make possible the widest possible geographical distribution of immigrants, it is important that the Government program itself provide for inland transportation costs as well as for reception services.

(Pursuant to the order of the Committee on the Judiciary, the following letter is also made part of the record:)

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST,
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
June 22, 1953.

To Agencies Interested in Emergency Legislation for Refugees.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am writing you not to ask your support for our position re emergency immigration legislation, nor to refute anyone's contrary interpretation of the present outlook but rather to satisfy my own conscience that I am sharing what seems to me to be the facts with you, who in one way and another have expressed friendship and confidence during all those recent months.

I have just returned from Washington where again I have had the privilege of conferring intimately and widely with Members of the Congress, both Democrats and Republicans and with the highest echelons in the administration. I have studied the confidential committee print which is the latest (as yet unreleased) version of the Watkins bill (a complete rewrite but little change save to add 5,000 escapees from Communist China).

In my judgment, shared by others in central positions of responsibility in Washington, there is little or no chance of the Watkins bill in its present form being reported out of committee. The reasons are quite clear:

1. *Overpopulation.*—There is strong sentiment that emergency legislation for United States immigration is not an adequate approach to this important problem of surplus population.

2. *Disproportion.*—Many feel that 75,000 Italians is out of line with fair treatment for refugee groups like Czechs, Hungarians, Russians, Balts, and German expellees and escapees who have paid, and are paying (Berlin e. g.) higher prices for their loyalty to the cause of freedom.

3. *Public Law 414.*—There is a strong belief that several groups and individuals fighting for the Watkins bill as now drafted are in reality seeking side-door changes in the quota system. (The National Council of Churches also wishes changes in Public Law 414 but believes we should not use emergency legislation as the occasion to debate them.)

4. *Security.*—For several in strategic positions, there is acute fear of infiltration.

The one hope I see is that the Watkins bill may be revised into an all-refugee bill which will remove, at least largely, the first three obstacles and thus open the way to deal rationally with the fourth. Reverified statements from the highest authorities in Greece and in Italy indicate their "content," "satisfaction," or "approval" of an all-refugee bill if it provides for a substantial and fair number of returnees, expellees, and refugees from their countries. These views are now being considered carefully by the committees and by some directly concerned in the administration.

The Congress, of course, is under extreme pressure to complete its schedule before adjournment. They also are being "assisted" by letters and wires being actively solicited from those who have reason to favor the Watkins bill as now drafted, those who continue to press this position must realize the great risk they are running in denying any possibility of aid to refugees.

There is a possibility, but, in my judgment, only a possibility, that as the Immigration Subcommittees and the administration (including the White House) reconsider the matter in terms of the factors noted above, they may see the desirability of revising those sections of the present draft which now apparently

are holding up committee approval. An all-refugee bill not only would stand the best chance of enactment; it would provide for people who are "our people"; they are not spies and saboteurs, they want to be good Americans in the struggle for world freedom and decency.

Our own position has been made clear: We stand for a refugee bill (one which will include Italian, Greek, and Dutch returnees). Our churches would find it exceedingly difficult to support or to participate in a program which on grounds of political expediency, discriminates so drastically between groups it seeks to help and against refugees.

This is for your information. You will know best whether and how to share this with your local groups across the country who believe that emergency legislation is urgently needed and that it should aid the homeless, the dispossessed, the escapees, the persecuted, the expelled. And they will know best whether and how to bring their truly American concerns to the attention of the President and the Immigration Subcommittees in the House and the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

ROLAND ELLIOTT,
*Director, Immigration Services,
Department of Church World Service.*

Senator WATKINS. We will now call Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council.

Will you give your full name, your address, and your occupation or profession for the record?

STATEMENT OF MERWIN K. HART, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. HART. My name is Merwin K. Hart. I am president of the national Economic Council, whose main office is in New York City.

Our objective is to maintain private enterprise and the American way of life and American independence. We are something over 20 years old.

A Federal grand jury of New York City reporting September 21, 1943, after it had heard the testimony of several hundred witnesses, suggested, according to the New York Times of September 22, 1943, that immigrants be admitted only on grounds in which "the paramount consideration is the welfare of the United States, not that of the immigrant."

It recommended further that immigrants be restricted to those "likely to contribute directly or indirectly to the welfare of the country and who may be readily assimilated as citizens."

Acting on authoritative statements such as the above, but only after the bars had been let down and hundreds of thousands of immigrants had been allowed to enter the country, the Senate Judiciary Committee commenced, 5 or 6 years ago, a revision and codification of the immigration laws.

The McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, which this pending bill would largely undermine, certainly reflected the sober thought of the Congress, and I believe, of the vast majority of the people. The fact that it was repassed over the President's veto has great significance. The people spoke through their representatives in Congress, just as they had spoken 9 years before through the presentment of that Federal grand jury in New York City.

Immediately after the final passage of the McCarran-Walter Act, propaganda was turned loose throughout the country to undo what the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Congress of the United States had so ably done. President Truman's hastily appointed com-

mittee to investigate immigration in a few weeks' time—the Congress having consumed 5 years in doing just this—could not possibly have accomplished any constructive work in the time available to it. It was merely the opening gun in the effort to tear down the immigration gates.

A measure of the extent of the propaganda behind the attempts to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act is the fact that presently the President was persuaded to recommend to the Congress the admittance of 240,000 refugees, and others, escapees—I mean that word generally—in addition to those authorized by existing law. I am sure that it escaped his notice that by this recommendation he was asking the Congress to stultify itself.

The National Economic Council is wholly opposed to this bill or to any bill that changes the McCarran-Walter Act, directly or indirectly, unless and until experience has shown that such changes are necessary.

Our reasons are as follows:

1. The country has a public debt of some \$260 billion, a national budget of around \$70 billion. Most States and municipalities have large public debt and heavy taxes. By this burden initiative is further discouraged and our continued existence as a free republic is threatened.

In more ways than one we have for a generation been mortgaging our country's future. The country is already in a very real sense overcommitted. Perhaps not overcommitted to those who think our resources are without limit. But certainly overcommitted from the standpoint of national prudence and common sense. We are committed to go to the defense of many countries, should they be attacked. We have given or loaned them many billions of dollars; and our present policy is to continue to subsidize them. Beyond this, we have taken many hundreds of thousands of aliens into this country, and among those admitted have unquestionably been many Communists. All these facts contributed to persuade the Congress to pass the McCarran-Walter Act.

Beyond this we are told by the recent MIT report that we have got to spend even more heavily if we are to bring about a real protection of this country against bombing assault from without. We need also to tighten up against assault from within.

Recently administration officials made the disappointing announcement that taxes could not be reduced this year and that it would be most difficult to balance the national budget—even though certain European countries we are helping generously, such as Britain, France, and others, are reducing their taxes. There have been stories, I do not know how authentic, that the debt limit would have to be raised over its present level, which I believe is \$275 billion.

Yet, in the face of these tremendous commitments and threatened additional burdens, this Senate bill 1917 recommends an initial appropriation of \$10 million; and it is a certainty that if the bill is passed, substantial additions would be made to the bureaucracy which the taxpayers of the country are already supporting.

2. We have not got the housing in this country to take in any considerable number of additional people. Recently the House threw out a provision for 35,000 additional housing units, but on May 6 the Senate Appropriations Committee put it back in the budget. Ap-

parently the committee feels that more housing is needed for people already in America.

3. There is now considerable unemployment and this is likely to increase. Therefore, there would not be jobs for any great number of immigrants, unless some of those presently employed were dropped to make way for them, which was done when so many aliens were admitted during and just after the last war.

4. There has been a high degree of fraud and deceit in the past in connection with an immigration policy that has permitted large numbers of aliens to enter this country. On January 6, 1950, Senator McCarran who, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, had recently returned from Europe, reported that the facts he had learned:

pointed to the inescapable conclusion that the flood gates of this Nation are being pried open for the entrance of millions of aliens, from the turbulent populations of the entire world, who are seeking admission into the United States under the guise of displaced persons.

Senator McCarran further reported:

inadequate screening of applicants with little or no regard to background, political beliefs and predilections of applicants * * *

He said:

My investigation has brought to light innumerable instances of wholesale fraud, misrepresentation, fictitious documents, and perjury resorted to by persons seeking displaced-persons status in order to qualify within the terms of the law.

The Senator further said that:

* * * the Attorney General of the United States recently testified that an analysis of 4,984 of the more militant members of the Communist Party in the United States showed that 91.4 percent of the total were of foreign stock or were married to persons of foreign stock.

The practice of deceit and fraud in the admission of aliens was well illustrated by the case of 984 refugees unlawfully brought into the United States by President Roosevelt during the early days of World War II and interned in the so-called Fort Ontario refugee shelter at Oswego, N. Y. Since Mr. Roosevelt had no authority to do this he merely informed the Congress of the fait accompli. It was asserted then that they would be returned to Europe after the war; but no sooner had they been settled in the Oswego camp than a propaganda move began to see that they were kept here. And the last time I made inquiry, which was in June of 1947, nearly all of them were still here.

When in 1941 we were forced into World War II, although the polls showed right up to December of that year that some 80 percent of the people were opposed to our entrance, we abandoned the idea of America first. All good Americans rallied to their country's defense and 300,000 of them laid down their lives.

During those war years aliens were brought in in large numbers into America, many of them to take the good jobs of Americans who had gone out to fight and die.

The principle of America first had been succeeded by the principle of "America last!"

It is my opinion, based upon past experience, that if this pending bill were to pass, it would be but the beginning of a whittling away of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Soviet Russia has doubtless intentionally permitted the recent and current escape of many refugees from behind the Iron Curtain.

Are we to permit Soviet Russia to control our policy, so that any time she chooses to let a few thousand escape to the West, that is to constitute a "crisis," which will compel us to upset one of our fundamental policies?

In our opinion, Mr. Chairman, this bill ought not to pass.

Senator WATKINS. Any questions? Senator Welker?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. Hart, you represent the National Economic Council, Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y. Could you generally tell me what that council is?

Mr. HART. Well, it is an organization of citizens, not large, with only a very few thousand members, but with members in all States. It was formed as the New York State Economic Council in the latter part of the 1920's, just about 1930, and it was formed because some of us in New York State who had formerly been members of the New York Legislature saw or thought we saw that there was a constant tendency to step up public spending and taxation, State and Federal, and municipal, too, for that matter, and constantly to step up also the regimentation of the citizen by government. That organization was formed to try and hold it back.

I think it was 1937, when we had been going on a statewide basis that we discovered and we said that these tendencies in our country were inspired by communism. Instantly we began to be attacked from all over the country, and at the same time we received approval of our position from all over the country. The name was then changed to the National Economic Council to suit the actual conditions.

Senator WELKER. About how many Americans do you represent?

Mr. HART. Well, it is hard to say. We have something over 2,000 actual members. We try to place them in strategic places and have all parts of the country represented. But our publications go each 2 weeks to ten or twelve thousand people, and oftentimes the circulation of our publications rises to a hundred thousand or even more. They go to many thousands of public libraries.

Senator WELKER. Do you have any idea, or have you made any study, of about how many aliens are in the United States today illegally?

Mr. HART. Senator, if you take the World Almanac and subtract the population of 1930 from the population of 1950, obviously you get the gain in population. Then if you take the excess of births over deaths in that same period, still from the World Almanac, and subtract them, you find the total number of people in the United States who must have come by immigration, legal or illegal. And it is between one and two millions as nearly as we figure it.

Now, it has been stated publicly, I believe, that there are from three to five million. I think Senator McCarran said that; three to five million Americans, unlawfully in the United States.

Senator WELKER. Counsel, have we ever had any testimony on that?

Mr. ARENS. Yes; the estimate is three to five million aliens in the United States, including, however, I should say, the Mexicans, and our estimate is that there are approximately a million to two million illegal Mexicans in the country, that is, the wetbacks, who are now getting clear up as far as New York City.

Senator WELKER. How did they get in?

Mr. ARENS. You mean the others?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Many of them, coming down from Canada at the present time, come in as what they call three-two's.

Senator WELKER. You say at the present time they are just flowing in from Canada?

Mr. ARENS. Oh, yes. Canada took about half a million displaced persons, and they are just coming right on in from Canada.

Senator WELKER. We do not need this bill, do we, if it is that easy to get in?

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask Mr. Arens.

Do the immigration officials say that?

Mr. ARENS. Oh, yes.

Senator WATKINS. How do they know? Do they go through the regular procedure?

Mr. ARENS. They pick them up. In New York City a few years ago they stamped out 50,000 cases of overstays in just one sweep.

Mr. HART. They come in on ships frequently.

Senator WATKINS. There is no doubt but what we have had lax administration in the past. That is one reason why I voted for a change, to clean it up. I hope we are going to have a little different situation. But when the statement is made that the immigration officials have come across that many, they must know about what is going on. Then why do they not stop it?

Mr. ARENS. In preparation for the McCarran-Walter Act, we spent about 3 years of intensive investigation of the system, took tens of thousands of pages of testimony. We had teams of our staff in almost every port of entry in the country, down on the Mexican border, up along the Canadian border, and we even sent them over to Cuba, talking to immigration officials. The situation has been pretty loose. And I don't condemn any individual at all, or any persons, because the immigration men, in my humble judgment, are as conscientious and able men as you will find in the service of the Government. I know many of them personally, and I know they are sincere in their intentions. But the pressure on the immigration system of this country is terrific. The quota is oversubscribed over a million, to take that alone.

Senator WELKER. You are conscious, Mr. Hart, that in many areas of the United States there is vast unemployment today?

Mr. HART. Yes. Among certain employees groups, I am certain of it. Like in central New York, where there is widespread unemployment among textile workers.

Senator WELKER. And up in the New England States.

Mr. HART. In New England, of course, and in Pennsylvania, the coal miners.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Martin told me of his tragic problem of unemployment, and I stated that in my State we are in tremendous trouble with regard to unemployment. The question is what we are going to do when we bring in 240,000 people, who must, of necessity, to exist, take jobs from these young people growing up, as you have stated in your statement, and those who are out fighting for our cause.

Mr. HART. In the State of New York, Senator, during the war, there was a sympathetic individual who was in the particular bureau of the board of regents that had the licensing of physicians. And

before it was discovered what he had done, he had licensed some 600 alien physicians, who really didn't meet the qualifications, and they proceeded, in many cases, and I believe most, to take the practices of the doctors who were mobilized and sent off to war. I don't believe the American people want to send their own sons over to war anywhere if the places of those sons are going to be taken, temporarily or permanently, by people just to meet a crisis or a supposed crisis in some foreign country.

Senator WELKER. I have just asked counsel whether or not there is an age limit to this bill on the refugees, whether or not they could not serve some of the free world overseas by helping to build strong armies, strong defense there. That causes us some concern.

Mr. HART. I suspect that a great many of them would not be interested in that. I don't know. That would be much better than to use our own men as fighters and allow these others to come in to take their places.

Senator, if I may throw a line of poetry into the situation, Shakespeare puts in the mouth of one of his players, an English king giving advice to his son, that he should "busy idle minds with foreign quarrels."

I think we can paraphrase that and say that there is too much of a tendency in this country to busy idle minds with foreign crises.

Now, there are many crises, of course, in other lands. There is great suffering. I do not doubt it. If we had done nothing to try to alleviate it, that would be one thing. But I think of the billions of dollars we have sent overseas to Europe and to other countries to try and relieve crises, and incidentally try to win friendship. It does not seem to have worked very well. At the present moment, look at the situation even with regard to our cousins, the British, with all that we have spent there. They are almost leaving us, on a matter of vital foreign policy in connection with Red China.

So I think our big crisis is with respect to the preservation of this country. I have not read the details of that Massachusetts Institute of Technology report. I believe the Alsop brothers first broke it. But apparently those men, those scientists, believe that this country is in the greatest danger from foreign attack because we could not repel such an attack and could not make one ourselves. And yet here we are interested all over the world in this, that, and the other thing, all important to those people.

A very distinguished European now living in this country, a very thoughtful man, remarked to me a year ago that his interest had been very much with his own country, that in his opinion the United States could do nothing more important for the world than to remain strong herself.

It seems to me that to pass this bill would be to undermine our strength. It would take our time, our effort, our money, to make it effective. And we wouldn't accomplish a great deal.

Senator WELKER. Thank you very much.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Reporter, at this point, I would like to put in the record a telegram from the Honorable Pat McCarran, addressed to me at the Senate Office Building, and dated May 26.

(The telegram referred to is as follows:)

LAS VEGAS, NEV., May 26, 1953.

JOHN BUTLER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Reports reach me early hearings scheduled on Senate bill 1917 to admit 240,000 immigrants above quotas. Urgently request you exert your influence toward deferral of hearings for brief period as I am extremely anxious to be present at all such hearings. Also urge hearings cover all bills dealing with refugee problem including Senate bill 1766, sponsored by Senator Watkins, subcommittee chairman, which proposes to unify many refugee agency activities in single office and apparently constitutes sound approach to refugee problem but does not embrace attack on our immigration system. We must be careful not to pass surplus population bill in guise of refugee measure, or permit classification of "refugees" in such way as to open door to wholesale Communist penetration of our borders. Proper screening of all entering aliens and adherence to established immigration standards is vital to our material welfare. I have confidence in your good judgment and fundamental Americanism to stand firm against the pressure blocs on these important principles. With regard to date for hearings on refugee bills deferral I request need not be long. I go to Los Angeles tonight to preside at Internal Security Subcommittee hearings there beginning next Thursday. Expect to be back in Washington morning of June 5. Thanks for your courtesy and consideration. Kindest regards.

PAT MCCARRAN.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Crete Anderson of the American Legion?

You may give your name and your address and your occupation or profession or official representation.

**STATEMENT OF CRETE ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE
ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF THE NATIONAL
AMERICANISM COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION**

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Crete Anderson. I am a businessman from Canton, Ohio, and not a paid employee of the American Legion staff. I represent the American Legion before you.

Senator WATKINS. You may be seated, if you wish.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you.

In behalf of the American Legion, I would like to thank the chairman and the gentlemen of the committee for the courtesy you have extended us in permitting us to present the highlights of the views of the American Legion on the proposed legislation before your committee.

I have here a prepared statement, which, with the consent of the chairman, I would like to read; and I would like to, if permitted, add additional comments when it seems necessary to expand on the thought expressed in the statement.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON. An omission has been made, Mr. Chairman, in the typing of the statement, and I would like the record to be corrected, to address the statement to the chairman and the gentlemen of the committee.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Americanism Manual of the American Legion, page 41, reads in part as follows:

The American Legion has consistently opposed any great influx of immigrants and has insisted that immigration should be on such a moderate and regulated scale that immigrants may be readily absorbed into the lifestream of our country. The Legion has insisted that immigrants should not be admitted in such

numbers that they would displace veterans from either employment or housing. It has supported the National Origins Quota Act of 1924 and Public Law 414, 82d Congress, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, which set a quota for immigration from the respective countries, based on a selective and restrictive system, in proportion to the number of United States citizens who themselves or through their ancestors originated in the respective countries. The Legion has vigorously opposed exceptions to this quota system except (1) as they applied to honorably discharged wartime veterans of the United States Armed Forces, their wives, or immediate dependents, and except (2) emergency admission of 400,000 displaced persons and German ethnics as the United States' fair share of this humanitarian task.

The Legion is convinced that efforts to effect entry into the United States of several hundred thousand additional displaced persons, escapees, evacuees, and expellees, together with substantial numbers of overpopulations and/or nationals of European countries, is a calculated attempt at a "back door" attack on the national-origins quota system as embodied in the McCarran-Walter Act aforesaid, supported, in the majority of instances, by the same groups which have advocated emasculating of the act to the extent that it would become ineffective legislation, forsaking our long-standing traditional policies. Such action beggars and ignores the fact that the proper committees of the Congress, duly elected representatives of the people of the United States, assisted by the Department of Justice, the Visa and Passport Divisions of the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other qualified and capable authorities, labored nearly 5 years in the formulation of the act; that approximately 1,000 persons testified in the hearings, including experts and Government officials, and that representatives of all groups concerned with the problems were heard.

The Legion has not in the past and is not now endeavoring to "expert" on all the technical phases of our complete immigration and naturalization laws, comprising 164 sections in the existing legislation, but, rather, confines itself to matters that fall within the purview of its stated policies, lore, and mandates. Among those that are pertinent to the subject matter before this committee are:

(1) The tightening of our gates against the entrance of all subversive, criminal, and illegal elements, and the deportation of like millions who have, legally or illegally, gained admission;

(2) A controlled steady influx of immigrants under the selective and restrictive provisions of the national origins quota system;

(3) A belief that migration to the United States is a privilege and not a right. The philosophy of "right of asylum," when unearned, falls on deaf ears in the Legion. We are somewhat bemused by the thought as to where Americans would find "right of asylum" even among the friendly countries, should total disaster befall us.

(4) The Legion believes that the essential and paramount element in any consideration of mass resettlements in the United States is: Is it good for the United States now and in the future? The Legion does not consider any such action to be presently beneficial and is dubious about future benefits.

The American Legion has been deeply concerned, for some time past, over the presence in our country of an estimated 3 million to 5 million illegal aliens, the potential danger to our industrial power and communication installations being readily apparent should the hour strike and we become involved in a war, declared or undeclared, with Russia.

The impossibility of properly screening the 125,000 escapees and expellees from behind the Iron Curtain, as proposed for resettlement in the United States under S. 1917, 83d Congress, due to the complete absence of any authentic information as to life history or background, could only result in our investigating agencies taking a coldly calculated risk that we can ill afford to take in these dangerous times. Should our investigators be 99 percent correct in their risky decisions and wrong in the remaining 1 percent, it would mean an addition of 1,250 potential spies and saboteurs to our present dangerous "powder-keg" situation. The proposal to allot the remaining 115,000 of the 240,000 total in S. 1917, 83d Congress, to nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands establishes a precedent that this Nation has invariably avoided in the past.

In connection with the statement made here in previous testimony given this morning that the 125,000 escapees would be a dangerous group with which to deal or offer any haven here in this country, the recent press releases from Western Germany state that 30,000 of the flood of escapees from the East to the West are known Communists.

Senator WALKER. Wait a minute. What was that again?

Mr. ANDERSON. That 30,000 are known Communists.

Senator BURKE. What was the percentage?

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement was that, of the escapees from behind the Iron Curtain who are now flooding into Western Germany, 30,000 are known Communists.

Senator WALKER. Where did you get that information?

Mr. ANDERSON. I got that, Senator, from recent press releases that came out of Germany. No effort is being made to return them, under the thought that, if they were returned, many more would come in anyhow. Because, knowing the use of the Communist lie as a potent weapon, as all of us are familiar with it, there is no way of screening them.

Senator WALKER. Do you have for the record any of those press releases?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; I do not, Senator. It is in the public realm, however. It was either an Associated Press or United Press release, which came to my attention some week or 10 days ago.

We will endeavor to secure it for you, Mr. Chairman, if you so desire. It is in the public realm.

Senator WATKINS. Who issued the press release?

Mr. ANDERSON. That, I do not know. I read it in one of the newspapers.

Senator WATKINS. I suspect there was considerable information in an article published in the U. S. News & World Report in an interview with Chancellor Adenauer.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may have read it there. I forget the source of it. They are making no effort to return these people, or to force them to return behind the Iron Curtain, for the reasons I have set forth.

Senator WATKINS. Did this have to do with the people who were coming through Berlin?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right, coming from East Berlin into West Berlin, and then being transferred to Western Germany.

Senator WATKINS. I understood, from statements made here previously, that the thought was that those who come in through Berlin

are probably not Communists, but they are people genuinely desirous of settling in the free area.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I just stated, Mr. Chairman, knowing the adept use of the lie that the Communist conspiracy makes, such statements are subject to serious question. In this article I have just referred to, the statement was also made that a 15-minute screening only was being given these people who are escaping from Eastern Berlin into Western Berlin, and that the only way they have of ascertaining whether or not they are actual or phony escapees is by the use on the part of some of them of certain Communist dialectics in their answers. That is about the only means they had of trapping them.

Senator WATKINS. Would you think that the United States, as a policy, ought to encourage the escape of people from behind the Iron Curtain into other countries?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, that gets into the field of psychological warfare, with which I am not too familiar.

The American Legion has a psychological-warfare program, and in my personal opinion, I do believe it is a good idea to endeavor to have them escape if we can handle it in any manner, shape, or form, other than the introduction of additional displaced persons or escapees into the United States.

Mr. ARENS. Well, the official policy of the United States Government overseas is against encouraging escapees from behind the Iron Curtain; is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That I am not familiar with, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. ARENS. We were told it was against the policy of the Government to encourage them, because they want the people to stay there and fight the Communists. That was what we were told last summer when we were there.

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been my opinion and the opinion of my associates in the American Legion for some time past that the Communists, if they so desired in the slightest, could stop this trek to the West. But they are making no effort to do it and are using it as an instrument of infiltration, with phony escapees who are Communists.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask you: Do you approve of the Voice of America programs?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Voice of America program under proper handling and direction? Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. The only program that we have had up to date is the one that has been in existence. Do you approve of the one that we have had?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say no, sir. We do not.

Senator WATKINS. I was just wondering. This is a new thought that has come into the situation, about these escapees and expellees. I can understand, of course, that the Communists will use every means possible to get people into these other countries, but at the same time if the Voice of America program is to be very effective it must certainly endeavor to disgust a lot of those people with the government, they are under over there, and the situation they are in. It would create, if they believe our broadcasts, a desire to get out of there just as quickly as they could and by any manner of means.

Mr. ARENS. We were told last summer they didn't do that, though. We were told it was against the policy to encourage them to come out.

Senator WELKER. I think the chairman is right that they have advocated that, Counsel.

Senator WATKINS. I do not know what they have actually done, but I have heard discussions time and again of what the Voice of America could do, to disgust the people with the conditions they have and the governments they have.

There are four ways those people could respond. They could say, "We are wholly indifferent," or, "We are going to stand by it," or "We are going to try and overthrow it," or, on the other hand they could say, "We are going to get away at the first opportunity and get out of here."

Senator WELKER. Why could they not do like the French underground did in the last war? They did a tremendous job. They really destroyed the Nazis. Mr. Chairman, will you allow to to ask a question?

Senator WATKINS. Surely. Go ahead.

Senator WELKER. At the outset, you said something to the effect that this was the opening wedge to undermine the McCarran-Walter Immigration bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you have occasion to see Mr. Murrow's television show several weeks ago with respect to these escapees being interviewed?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir, I did not, Senator. I am sorry; I missed that.

Senator WELKER. In that show, I was impressed that several of the people being interviewed made reference to the McCarran-Walter Act, with the statement that they could not get in by virtue of that, that their only hope was the passage of a bill of this sort.

I do not know whether they had any ulterior motive or not. Perhaps they were correct. But it was just something I wanted to ask you about, for your observation.

Senator WATKINS. Senator, I have just been advised that this is the second call, and I wonder if we could yield at this moment and come back as soon as we have reported.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I have at least partially covered the Senator's question.

Senator WATKINS. It is 12:15. We might just as well pick up at 1:30. We can start then, and the reporter can read back the question the witness has not answered.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator WATKINS. The subcommittee will resume session.

Will you read back the last question to the witness?

Senator WELKER. As I recall, the witness did answer my last question. I believe that he can find his point in the statement. I think it will save time to start from there, Mr. Chairman, because I know he answered my question.

Senator WATKINS. Proceed.

Senator WELKER. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct, Senator. However, if I may, before I resume reading from the statement, I would like to comment that

the position of the American Legion on psychological warfare was action at the New York convention last August. It approved the Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act, which urges escapees from behind the Iron Curtain to be molded into NATO units.

Senator WATKINS. You mean military units?

Mr. ANDERSON. Military units; yea, sir.

Senator WATKINS. What would they do with the women and children?

Mr. ANDERSON. That, Mr. Chairman, was not our position at all. It was strictly the Kersten amendment which called for these specific objectives which we approved.

Senator WATKINS. What I mean, did your program envisage women and children escaping with the men, or did you encourage escapees only among the male population?

Mr. ANDERSON. In the field of conjecture it would purely be on my part, that the wives and children, if possible, would escape along with the head of the family. Of course, they could not be molded into NATO units.

Senator WATKINS. That is why I asked the question. What provisions would you have to take care of them?

Senator WELKER. As an observation, we would not have any more provisions taking care of them in this bill because in this bill, as I understand it, they bring them; is that correct?

Senator WATKINS. This bill talks to keep the family together. I was just commenting on the program the American Legion adopted in encouraging escapees, for the purpose of having them molded into military units under NATO. Of course, it involves a family matter. No man in his right senses would escape unless he made provisions for his family, somehow or other, because the minute he joined NATO then his family would probably be exterminated or sent to a concentration camp. That would be the end of that.

Mr. ANDERSON. To some extent any members of any army would be somewhat in the same position with reference to their family.

Senator WATKINS. That is right, if they are behind the Iron Curtain. If the Communists won they would certainly pick out the fellows who were fighting them and both those people and their families would suffer the usual fate they suffer in any other countries that the Communists take over.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding, I would like to say I received a telegram from Senator McCarran. I wonder if it would be permissible to insert that in the record at this point?

Senator WATKINS. I have no objection. I call to your attention Senator Butler put one in this morning. I suppose it has the same effect.

Senator WELKER. I suppose it is the same telegram, but I imagine in deference to him—I do not want to increase the record—it could be stated that Senator Welker received the same telegram. I think it is the same telegram and that would save increasing the volume of the record, if it is all right with you.

Senator WATKINS. It is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. ANDERSON. To continue on that question regarding psychological warfare and the position taken at the New York Convention of the American Legion, as I have just stated, we reaffirmed that position last October by national executive committee action and deplored

the apparent failure to properly implement the provisions of the Kersten amendment.

Senator WATKINS. For the purpose of the record, do you happen to have a copy of the Kersten amendment here?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not, sir.

Senator WATKINS. I have just been handed a copy which I shall read into the record:

*** and not to exceed \$100 million of such appropriation for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union or Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, or the Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany and Austria and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when it is similarly determined by the President that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Proceeding with the statement of the American Legion, in an article titled "The Truth About the Immigration Act" by Representative Francis E. Walter appearing in the May 1953 issue of Reader's Digest, the following figures are most interesting:

Of the more than 1 million Europeans resettled by the International Refugee Organization, 1 out of 3 has been taken by the United States. There remains, however, 10 million refugees from communism in Western Germany and, in other free areas of Europe there are probably that many more. Overpopulation in Europe has been estimated as high as 79 million with a yearly increase of 3 million.

I might state, Mr. Chairman, that, as testified here this morning, our population is increasing at an estimated rate of around 2 million per year.

Senator WATKINS. I think it is a little higher than that. It must be around 2½ million plus the immigration.

Mr. ANDERSON. Any additional contribution that could be made by the United States to the solution of this gigantic problem of resettlement, through admissions to the United States as proposed in S. 1917, 83d Congress, could be only a token gesture and making no substantial impression on the overall problem, and could create potential problems within our own borders when men in our Armed Forces return to civil life or in the event of a recession following a predicted peace.

I might comment there with your consent, Mr. Chairman, that in most of the presentations toward the bringing of the unfortunate people of Europe to the United States, no reference is made to the possibility of a recession in the United States if the predicted peace or rumored peace, if you please, either phony or genuine, ever is attained.

Two hundred and forty thousand would constitute approximately one-fourth of 1 percent of the total escapees, expellees, evacuees, and overpopulations in Europe. I base that on the figures used by Representative Walter in his Reader's Digest article to which the statement has previously referred.

The American Legion watches with battlewise eyes and a growing sense of injustice and frustration, together with tens of thousands of heartbroken mothers and fathers, the loading of the ships in San Francisco with the cannon fodder for Korea in the persons of our sons and rightful heirs. The Legion has, also, observed the steady gaze eastward of many segments of our society, with barely a glance

westward, for they are, apparently, more interested in the trek to America than in the trek away from it.

In the latter case, in many instances it will be some boys' final trek. That concludes the statement.

Senator WATKINS. In connection with your statement, I would like to say to you that the chairman of this committee voted for the McCarran Act and supported it and defended it in speeches only very recently and I am still very much in favor of it as a permanent immigration policy of the United States.

As chairman of the joint committee, studying operation of this act, I am resisting any amendments that would emasculate the act. There is a difference of opinion as to whether or not this will emasculate that act. The Commander in Chief in connection with the fighting of this war has asked that certain things be done to help win the war. I have great confidence in his leadership. Notwithstanding my belief in the McCarran Act, I think this bill can be justified. I do not speak as one who has been fighting the McCarran Act.

I would like to ask you this one question. Do you have a resolution supporting the position adopted by the American Legion?

Mr. ANDERSON. If it is agreeable, I would like to submit for the record the American Legion's position and mandates on the McCarran-Walter Act.

Senator WATKINS. We will receive it.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, APRIL 29-30, MAY 1, 1953

RESOLUTION NO. 31. COMMISSION: AMERICANISM. TITLE: M'CARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 414, 82D CONG., 2D SESS.)

Whereas Public Law 414 (82d Cong., 2d sess.), known as the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, has been subjected to vicious Communist-inspired attacks by the Moscow press and radio, the Daily Worker, and the Peoples Daily World, Communist-controlled newspapers published in the United States, said attacks being supported by other organizations and groups of known Communist-front origin or subject to question as to their American loyalties, all such attacks urging repeal of the act; and

Whereas other groups and elements of our society affected by, or interested in, our immigration and naturalization laws have taken exception to certain sections and/or subsections of Public Law 414, contending that inequities and discriminations exist therein and, as a result, are advocating repeal of the entire law; and

Whereas a special Commission was created by the President in September 1952, following passage of the legislation over a Presidential veto, said Special Commission being empowered to study, hold hearings, and make recommendations pertaining to the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States and render their findings by January 1, 1953, despite the fact that the proper committees of the Congress, assisted by the Department of Justice, the Immigration Service, the Visa and Passport Divisions, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other qualified authorities had labored more than 4 years in the creation of this omnibus bill, consisting of 164 sections, with some sections having more than 40 subsections; and

Whereas this special Commission, appointed by the President for a tenure of 4 months, has rendered findings, opinions, and recommendations designated to nullify or repeal the security safeguards and other protective measures of Public Law 414, including the national-origins quota system, and supplant them with a policy of immigration regulation by a politically appointed "administrative agency," thus subjecting the Nation to the manipulations and special interests of numerous political and minority pressure groups in this vital field of public safety and welfare; and

Whereas the American Legion, at a regular meeting of the national executive committee, November 1951, adopted resolution No. 18, supporting the proposed legislation, on the basis that the proposed law would provide:

1. A system of selective immigration within the national-origins quota system, geared to the needs of the United States.
2. A more thorough screening especially of security risks.
3. Structural changes in the enforcement agencies for greater efficiency.
4. Strengthening of exclusion and deportation procedures.
5. Strengthening of naturalization and denaturalization procedures to weed out subversives and other undesirables from citizenship; and

Whereas Public Law 414 not only contains these 5 safeguards to our public safety and welfare, but provides, under section 401 (a) for a "Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy," composed of 5 members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and 5 members of the like committee in the House of Representatives, empowered to make a continuous study of the act and submit reports to the Senate and House concerning such recommendations as it deems desirable to correct any inequities or discriminations existing in the law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, through action of the national executive committee, in regular meeting assembled April 29, 30, and May 1, 1953, supports the principles and objectives of Public Law 414, as set forth in the five points afore-mentioned herein; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion deplore the untimely attacks on Public Law 414 which became effective law December 24, 1952, urges an adequate period of trial, and expresses confidence in the joint committee to recommend correction of any inequities or discriminations, within the limits of the safety and welfare of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion opposes any and all attempts now being made to repeal in toto said Public Law 414 of the 82d Congress and hereby directs the national legislative commission to take any and all steps necessary to defeat any bills now pending, or that may hereafter be introduced, in Congress which call for the repeal in toto of the said law; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion does hereby oppose any and all attempts now being made to materially weaken, destroy, amend, or repeal those provisions of the said Public Law 414 of the 82d Congress which the American Legion has heretofore advocated or supported, and hereby directs the national legislative commission to take any and all steps necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. We also have a resolution which is an existing mandate that covers all legislation or proposed legislation of this type. This resolution became a mandate in October 1952.

Prior to the incumbency of the present administration bills of this nature—I think you gentlemen will agree—have been a continuing thing since the expiration of the Displaced Persons Act of 1947, as amended in 1949, if I am correct in the year there.

If the chairman please, I will read the resolving clause of the resolution adopted by the American Legion in October 1952.

Senator WATKINS. We will be very glad to have you do so.

Mr. ANDERSON (reading):

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, through its national commander petition the President of the United States and the Congress, to oppose the contemplated importation of several hundred thousand additional displaced persons into the existing and future uncertain economy of our country.

It might be pertinent to read a portion of one of the whereas clauses:

* * * we must oppose the entrance into this country and particularly into our metropolitan areas of several hundred thousand additional displaced persons for whom a concerted effort toward admission into the United States is presently being made through the medium of submitted and contemplated bills to the Congress of the United States.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution became a mandate of the Legion last October 1952.

Senator WATKINS. What is your official position with the Legion?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the National Americanism Commission and I must beg the pardon of the chairman and the gentlemen of the committee for failure to include that in my opening statement.

Senator WATKINS. That is the reason I asked that. I wanted the record to show that you were here not just as a member of the American Legion, but that you had some official position. I know many American Legion men who are supporting the present bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, you just stated your position and your connection with the enactment of the McCarran-Walter Act and I would like to state in behalf of the American Legion that tens of thousands of legionnaires all over the United States, including this individual, read with great interest virtually every word of your hearings pertaining to the McCarran-Walter Act in the 5 long years that you labored in that direction.

I would like to state further that that same thing applies to many thousands of legionnaires in regard to the courageous action of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary through the many years that you gentlemen on that committee and the Subcommittee on Internal Security, along with the counsel present here, who labored so courageously and diligently to expose the Communist conspiracy and infiltration into virtually every field of American life. I realize how you were rebuffed and your honorable positions were not recognized, because, in a more humble way, we in the American Legion who labor in the same field in the form of an avocation, have been called superpatriots, we have been maligned, and we have been condemned, but we proudly plead guilty to the accusation of superpatriots.

Senator WATKINS. I will say all three members of the committee here today are members of the Internal Security Subcommittee and two of us have been on it ever since its inception.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that, Senator. I have read virtually every word of the testimony before that committee in the past several years.

Senator WELKER. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Anderson, do you have any information or does your organization have any information as to whether or not any of these individuals have been screened up to now?

Mr. ANDERSON. Do you mean the ones that are currently coming coming through?

Senator WELKER. Yes, the ones that could come in here if this legislation was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Senator, the only information that would be available that I know of—and that is why I referred to it—is this article that was in the public press, and—I cannot identify the article, but it was in the public press and we are endeavoring to locate it and if we can find it we will be very happy to send it to you and have it incorporated in the record—which stated that these people were coming through in such numbers that they were confined through lack of time to giving them a cursory 15-minute screening and that the language in which they answered stated questions was used as a means of ascertaining as to whether or not they were genuine escapees or phony escapees. If they answered in certain terms and used possible Communist dialectics, they were so branded.

There are 80,000 of them that have been so branded. Am I talking on the subject you are talking about?

Senator WELKER. Yes. Would you agree with the Senator from Idaho that one of the difficult parts of this bill is the proper screening of a refugee or escapee from behind the Iron Curtain, when the only evidence you can possibly get is either that from a security agent who happens to be behind the Iron Curtain or the oral statement of the refugee himself?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, Senator, and with the consent of the chairman, I will repeat a portion of the statement that I have just read to you here:

The American Legion has been deeply concerned for some time past, over the presence in our country of an estimated 3 to 5 million illegal aliens, the potential danger to our industrial, power, and communication installations, being readily apparent should the hour strike and we become involved in a war, declared or undeclared, with Russia.

The impossibility of properly screening the 125,000 escapees and expellees from behind the Iron Curtain, as proposed for resettlement in the United States under S. 1017, 83d Congress, due to the complete absence of any authentic information to life history or background, could only result in our investigating agencies taking a coldly calculated risk that we can ill afford to take in these dangerous times. Should our investigators be 99 percent correct in their risky decisions, and wrong in the remaining 1 percent, it would mean an addition of 1,250 potential spies and saboteurs to our present dangerous "powder keg" situation.

Senator EASTLAND. How is it possible to adequately screen them?

Mr. ANDERSON. In my opinion, Senator, it cannot be done. Through the operation of our regular immigration service under the national origins quota system, the American consul has access to the immigrant's home town, his background, his life history, and so on and so forth, and even in those cases they make some mistakes.

Here all of that information is denied them, and with respect to a recently arrived individual from behind a closed wall you have no way of knowing, Senator, in my opinion, whether or not he is a genuine escapee or phony escapee.

Senator EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that we know and the intelligence agencies know that Russian agents are being sent through and placed to come into this country via the avenue of displaced persons?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, Senator, in my opinion. I made the statement this morning that knowing the Communist conspiracy as you gentlemen well do and the use of the lie, one of their most potent weapons, they are using this thing as a means of infiltration among the escapees, and they certainly could stop this flood of people who are crossing from east to west Berlin if they so desired.

Senator EASTLAND. Is it your judgment if this bill were enacted into law, that because of it we would get Russian spies and saboteurs in the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. As I stated here, if they make a mistake of at least 1 percent, it would bring 1,250 potential spies and saboteurs into the United States.

Senator EASTLAND. You also stated it was impossible to screen them.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is in my opinion, impossible to screen them.

Senator EASTLAND. I am asking whether or not in your judgment if this bill is enacted into law, it will result in Russian spies and saboteurs gaining admittance into the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I can safely answer that with a positive yes, Senator. I do not see how it can be avoided.

Senator EASTLAND. Mr. Anderson, you have studied the problem of displaced persons, escapees, and surplus population of Europe, have you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, I have.

Senator EASTLAND. You have spent considerable time on those great problems. I want to ask you, from your knowledge what would be accomplished by the passage of this bill? Would it tend to solve those problems?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would make no substantial impression whatever on the overall problem.

Senator EASTLAND. What possibly could result to the benefit of the United States by the passage of this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Referring to my statement, the Legion believes that the essential and paramount element in any consideration of mass resettlements in the United States is, Is it good for the United States now and in the future?

The Legion does not consider any such action to be presently beneficial and is dubious about future benefits.

Senator EASTLAND. You do not think there could be any benefit to this country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I see no benefit and I see the possibility of danger and conflicting searches for jobs and housing if, as, and when the predicted peace comes about and a possible 2 million young men are released from service. And we must bear in mind, gentlemen, that these are young men, the great majority of our present Armed Forces in Korea, recently out of high school, 18, 19, and 20 years old, who have never had a job, at least many of them, or those who have had jobs, have not had a job a sufficient length of time to establish any seniority or any stability in the opinion of their employer, so they would be thrown into the wide-open field of employment as we were in 1920 and 1921, which I well remember as a veteran of World War I, when 1,250,000 immigrants had been admitted to the United States in the years of 1920 and 1921.

We came out of the service, back from France, and ran headlong into a depression. Thank heavens it did not last long. However, for the time being it was pretty rough on the man who got \$60 when he was discharged from the service at the end of World War I.

Senator WELKER. May I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Senator WELKER. This morning I asked you a question and I will ask you again for the benefit of Senator Eastland. We admit that the boys who are serving in Korea are not exactly enjoying their tour of duty and, by like token, those serving in Europe and all over the globe.

Would it be your testimony, Mr. Anderson, that these people if they were loyal, loyal to the free world, could do more benefit to the cause of freedom by remaining in the Soviet Union or the satellite countries under Soviet control, by staying there and undermining from within the Soviet conspiracy, as did the French underground so nobly in World War II against the Nazis?

Mr. ANDERSON. Senator, that is a most difficult question for one to answer who has not been behind the Iron Curtain.

Senator WATKINS. Is it not much more difficult, too, because in the case of the French underground, they had contacts with the Allies and planes flew over and dropped them supplies; they parachuted material in to them time and time and time again, which cannot be done with Russia and the satellite countries, until we are in a state of war.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am of the opinion, Senator, that 90 percent at least of the people in Russia and the satellite countries would be most happy to escape if it were possible. They would be most happy to revolt if it were possible. Otherwise why should they have such a strong MVD and military units to control their populations, and why do they disarm every citizen so they cannot revolt?

Senator WATKINS. You have explained how difficult it is—and in your view it is practically impossible—to screen these people who come from behind the Iron Curtain. A few moments ago you told us about the Legion's psychological warfare plan to encourage escapees from behind the Iron Curtain to enter into the NATO forces. Would you tell us how you would screen those people if it is practically impossible to screen the others?

You indicated also you thought the wives and children ought to come with them. How are we going to do it and screen them for the Army if you cannot screen them under a bill like this?

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly if they cannot fight in the NATO services they do not belong in this country as residents.

Senator WATKINS. They would not belong in this country. I am talking about getting them into the NATO countries.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand. The American Legion endorsed the Kersten amendment. The Lodge amendment we did not oppose. We favored the organization of these escapees into NATO units. The Lodge idea is to take them into the United States Army under a 5-year enlistment, but they first must learn or be able to speak a reasonable amount of English. Correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Counsel, if you will.

Mr. ARENS. The Lodge amendment has not been put into effect in any consequence.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is my understanding, Mr. Counsel, that there have been 565 men assembled under this agreement whereby they must serve a 5-year term in the United States military forces, and they are subject to the complete control of those forces and they are subject to assignment anyplace. It is my understanding that 50 of them have been brought to the United States and are being trained here at one of our camps.

Mr. ARENS. However there is no wholesale influx into the Army?

Mr. ANDERSON. No wholesale influx. Provisions were made for 12,500, I think, as a sample case or a test of the idea. In 2 years they have only enlisted 565 men.

Senator WATKINS. That is all very interesting and it is all very good, but you have not explained yet how you would screen those people. You say it is impossible to screen them if they are brought here. You say we cannot screen those we are going to bring here, but it would be all right to take the same kind of people behind the Iron Curtain and put them in an Army over there and bring their wives and children. What would be the process of screening before you gave them a gun or put them in charge of a plane?

Mr. ANDERSON. In military training you do not place a gun in a man's hands until he goes through some training.

Senator WATKINS. Eventually.

Mr. ANDERSON. They at least do have time and personal and intimate contact with these men for a reasonable period of time. I am sure that the United States Army would not send a man to any sensitive spot if they were the least bit suspicious of him.

We had many Communists in the United States Army during World War II as you gentlemen well know.

Senator WATKINS. I know we have a lot of aliens in the Army now, but you still have not said what the screening method would be. That is what I am interested in. I am not asking this to trap you. I want some information. It seems nothing could be used in screening people for immigrants over here who later on, the male portion at least, might become a part of our Armed Forces, and we would have the women and children out of danger, and the men could go back and fight.

Mr. ANDERSON. Constant surveillance over a long period of time would serve as a much more definite screening if the Army Intelligence Service is as efficient as I am certain it is. Those men unquestionably would be very closely observed if they were enlisted in the United States Army and they would probably be under such extreme suspicion that if they had any tendencies toward communism or any subversive tendencies, they would have to be rather expert to conceal it.

There is a possibility of surveillance there that does not exist in a proposal of the nature of S. 1917, to bring 125,000 of these escapees, directly to the United States with what could only be a cursory examination under which the investigators would have to take a coldly calculated risk.

Senator EASTLAND. Those who enlist in the NATO are not being brought to the United States. Is not that the answer?

Mr. ANDERSON. This Lodge provision is to enlist them in the United States Army. That is not the Kersten amendment.

Senator WATKINS. I think most of it is still devoted to the Lodge proposal to take these escapees, refugees, and others and give them something to do and let them fight.

Senator WELKER. Let me ask one question about the Lodge amendment that I think we all voted for. Is it not correct that under the terms of the Lodge amendment after one of these refugees, or displaced persons had served 5 years in the Army of the United States he was to be granted citizenship in the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is my understanding.

Senator WELKER. And notwithstanding that fact in nearly 2 1/2 years we have had 500 enlistees in the Army with that promise?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right. Five hundred and sixty-five as of the 30th of April are the figures we obtained this morning previous to appearing here.

Mr. ARNS. May I make an observation on the basis of the information we acquired in Europe last summer?

There have been many more than 500 apply and many more than the maximum number permitted by the Lodge amendment who would have enlisted, so the Army officials told us, but the Army itself has been so rigorous with its screening standards that only 500 of the

many thousands who have been applying or who would apply have been accepted.

Senator WATKINS. And many of them were turned down for physical reason, I take it!

Mr. ARENS. I assume so, Senator.

Senator EASTLAND. In what length of time?

Mr. ARENS. Ever since the Lodge amendment went into effect.

Senator WATKINS. They turned down many in the draft not because they were not loyal, but because they could not qualify physically and mentally.

Mr. ANDERSON. One out of six we are taking.

Senator WELKER. I might observe that a subversive would do some thinking twice before he goes into the military service because it is much more difficult to turn him loose throughout this land, as they have a certain thing known as a firing squad and court-martial that people of that ilk do not exactly enjoy.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Anderson, are you conversant with the companion bill or another bill that the Senator from Utah has introduced, S. 1760, to create the office of the Commissioner of Refugees and coordinate all of the relief programs of the many governmental and inter-governmental agencies all over the world?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am somewhat familiar with it, Mr. Counsel, but the American Legion has taken no position on that bill.

Senator WELKER. Is that because they have not had time to study it?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. The one that Mr. Arens is talking about was introduced nearly a month before the last one you are talking about. I was in hopes you would get around to the one I introduced first.

Mr. ANDERSON. You mean after 1917?

Senator WATKINS. S. 1760 was introduced quite a long time ago and the other one was introduced just very recently.

Mr. ARENS. S. 1760 is not a migration bill. It is only a relief bill.

Senator WATKINS. It is a refugee bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. The American Legion position, Mr. Chairman, that covers S. 1917 was taken in October of 1952. That is a continuing mandate during the term of the 83d Congress.

Senator WATKINS. I would be interested to see just what the American Legion would do with this current bill if it were brought to their attention because I have had a lot of Legionnaires tell me they thought it was a good bill. We are getting testimony from you, but there are a lot of Legionnaires that have different views from some of the officials. I assume the President of the United States is a member of the American Legion, is he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would be very happy to bring it before the subcommittee on immigration. I might comment, if I may, Mr. Chairman, that the American Legion is wholeheartedly supporting, I think it is S. 1760, your bill for expeditious naturalization of alien members of the Armed Forces.

We are wholeheartedly in favor of that bill because like bills were passed in World War I and World War II.

Senator WELKER. In fairness to this witness, I think I would like to make the observation that he is not familiar with your bill even though it was introduced over a month ago. He is not familiar with it even though it was introduced before S. 1917.

Senator WATKINS. The one I am talking about and the one Mr. Arens has been asking questions about is S. 1766 which was introduced comparatively recently by me to provide for a Commissioner of Refugees and put the operation of the refugee program under one head.

We had it before the Subcommittee on Refugees here just the other day, and it was authorized favorably in the full committee and a full report has been circulated. It has been circulated among the members and I think you have one in your office, as do all members of the committee.

Mr. ARENS. It is not a migration bill. It is a bill to coordinate all of the relief activity under one head. They have over 10 different governmental or intergovernmental agencies dealing with the refugee problem.

Senator WATKINS. In addition to directing the refugees it would have an indirect effect and a powerful effect upon the immigration problem because they might want to integrate them or to get them to the lands where they have more room for them and where they need them. To that extent I think it would be a powerful measure in the interest of even the immigration problem. It would help solve the necessity of a lot of immigration, particularly into the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should be very pleased, Mr. Chairman, to study the bill and see that the other members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization study the bill and the members of the National Americanism Commission, and at the earliest date possible give official action on it.

Senator WATKINS. We would be pleased to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON. The legislative date on the bill as it appears here, S. 1766, is April 6, 1953, so it was introduced 6 or 7 weeks ago; is that correct?

Senator WATKINS. That is about right, and the other one has been here less than a month probably.

Are there any other questions? Thank you for your testimony. It has been very helpful to have received your views and analysis of the bill.

The next witness is Mrs. James C. Lucas, of the DAR. I assume that is Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mrs. LUCAS. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Will you state for the record your name, address, your occupation or profession, if any, and the group that you represent so we will have it for the record?

**STATEMENT OF MRS. JAMES C. LUCAS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN
REVOLUTION**

Mrs. LUCAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senators, for allowing me to make a statement today. I am Mrs. James C. Lucas, executive secretary, national defense committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask this? Do you have a resolution or anything authorizing you to appear and state the position of the organization, or do you pretend to speak for the whole organization?

Mrs. LUCAS. I do not pretend to speak. I was asked to come to testify because we have an adamant resolution for Public Law 414, which is the McCarran-Walter immigration bill.

Senator WATKINS. You have no directive on this particular bill?

Mrs. LUCAS. No, sir; because our Congress met in April and this bill was introduced on May 15, 1953, but we feel that it is a wedge to undermine the immigration law and that everybody should be alerted to that fact, so I was asked to come officially and testify.

Senator WATKINS. The bill itself has never been submitted to any of your bodies?

Mrs. LUCAS. No, sir.

Senator WATKINS. All right, proceed.

Senator EASTLAND. Who requested you to testify?

Mrs. LUCAS. My national president, Miss Gertrude Caraway.

Senator WELKER. Does your national president have some idea of the testimony that you will give?

Mrs. LUCAS. Yes, sir; my national chairman, Mrs. James B. Patton, and the president general, Miss Gertrude Caraway, requested that I appear for the organization officially.

Senator EASTLAND. Would you let us have for the record a copy of the resolution?

Mrs. LUCAS. Yes, sir.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 61ST CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, APRIL 14-15, 1952

Whereas a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary over the course of approximately 3 years has conducted an exhaustive investigation and study of our present immigration and naturalization system; and

Whereas as a result of such investigation and study, Senator Pat McCarran, chairman of this subcommittee, introduced Senate bill 2550, which merges, revises, and codifies all of the immigration and naturalization laws, and a companion bill (H. R. 5678) was introduced by Representative Francis E. Walter in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas these bills provide for screening aliens more carefully as regards potential subversives:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reassert its principle that no immigration over and above that provided under the present quota system shall be permitted into the United States; and

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, go on record as congratulating the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary in reporting to their respective bodies the McCarran-Walter bill and urge Congress to enact said bill into law.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 62D CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, APRIL 20-24, 1953

Whereas the enforcement manpower available to the Visa Division of the Department of State and to the Immigration and Naturalization Service has not been increased proportionately to the increase in the workload of those two agencies of the Federal Government; and

Whereas at the present time there are in the United States from 3 to 5 million illegal aliens; and

Whereas entries of illegal aliens into the United States and violations of the immigration laws of this country are increasing at an alarming rate; and

Whereas the statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reveal that an analysis of approximately 5,000 "of the more militant members of the Communist Party" show that 91.5 percent of them were either of foreign birth, married to persons of foreign birth, or born of foreign parents, and that over half of them traced their origins either to Russia or to her satellite countries; and

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act closes the loopholes in the old law through which thousands of subversive and criminal aliens enter this country, constituting a continuing threat to the safety of our institutions:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, go on record as favoring a substantial increase in the appropriations to the Visa Division of the Department of State and to the Immigration and Naturalization Service so that there may be full and vigorous enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act to the end that illegal and subversive aliens will be apprehended and deported.

Mrs. Lucas. The McCarran-Walter bill became the law of the United States on immigration when it was passed over President Truman's veto by a vote of 57 to 20. The Senators who voted for this bill knew that it was a 3-year study—and I think I will have to correct that, as I have heard this afternoon that it was almost a 5-year study—and compilation of those rules and regulations on immigration which have been established over the last 25 years.

The law did not go into effect until December 24, 1952. Yet there are already efforts to undermine it. Extensive hearings were held in which the experts of the CIA, Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Visa and Passport Divisions of the State Department, and many organizations testified for the bill.

S. 1917 would be the first wedge for the destruction of our immigration laws.

How are we going to check and who is going to decide whether these 240,000 "escapees" left the Soviet Union or the Communist-dominated countries because of persecution or fear?

In a resolution adopted by the 4,000 delegates to the 62d Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution we quote a report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

The statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reveal that an analysis of approximately 5,000 of the more militant members of the Communist Party show that 91.5 percent of them were either of foreign birth, married to persons of foreign birth, or born of foreign parents, and that over half of them traced their origins either to Russia or to her satellite countries. * * *

This should be a warning to each and every American.

Line 9 (b) on page 2 of S. 1917, it states in part:

German expellee means any person of German ethnic origin residing in the area of the German Federal Republic, western sector of Berlin, or in Austria who was born in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia. * * *

What a golden opportunity for these Communist-dominant countries to plant subversives under the guise of "expellees" with the definite aim to enter and undermine our Republic. The bill calls for "thorough investigation" but violations of the immigration law are increasing and there are today between 3 million and 5 million illegal aliens roaming around these United States. Wouldn't it be a more practical idea to give the money allocated for these escapees to our Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Visa Division of the State Department so they will have the staff to uphold the immigration law? These services are now so overloaded with work that they cannot weed out and deport the aliens we have today. How can we expect them to screen 240,000 more?

Looking at the bill from a practical standpoint, within a very few years these "expellees" will become eligible for social security, aid for the aged and unemployment compensation. The overburdened American taxpayer is looking for relief. We have been warned that if at any time the average tax take exceeds 25 percent of the average income, Americans cannot save for their future needs, for emergencies, and for old age. The incentive to work is destroyed. The average tax is now about 33 percent of the average income. We are well above the danger line. Are we to follow the prophecy of Stalin, "I shall force the United States to spend itself to bankruptcy," for these "expellees" have not paid into the funds for social security, aid for the aged and unemployment compensation, so the American taxpayer will not have lower taxes, but indubitably higher taxes to take care of these "special visa" immigrants.

The section on page 3 stating that visas will be issued to "their spouses, and their unmarried children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren," opens the door for payment to an unscrupulous person who would adopt children or claim stepchildren merely to get them into the United States.

On page 5 (d):

The coordinator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this act.

But it does not say within the established immigration law of the United States. Does the coordinator make his own rules without the approval of our Senators?

On page 9, section 9, it states:

Persons receiving visas under this act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Why?

Page 149, Public Law 414, section 281, the following fees shall be charged:

- (1) For the furnishing and verification of each application for an immigrant visa (which shall include the furnishing and verification of the duplicate), \$5;
- (2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, \$20; * * *

Are 240,000 aliens without funds to be allowed into the United States? If not, why make an exception of \$25? It certainly sounds as though that were true when one reads on page 12 that \$10 million is to be loaned "to public or private agencies for the purpose of financing the ocean transportation and the reception and the transportation from the ports of entry to the places of their resettlement * * *." So the American taxpayer even pays to bring these aliens into the United States. The word "loan" is used, true, but when have we been paid back for any loan or lend-lease or foreign aid?

In the United States Yearbook of 1951, which is the most recent one available, on page 528 in the report of the IRO (International Refugee Organization) it states that more than 1 million refugees have been repatriated and resettled by the end of 1951; that in 1952, 47,000 more will have been taken care of and, to quote:

However there would remain a limited number in various areas for whom the problem would not have been satisfactorily resolved.

It gives the areas, and as I add the number it comes to 121,750, but we are asked to take 240,000. Perhaps it's because the report goes on to say:

This continuous influx, in the opinion of IRO, emphasized the permanent character of the refugee problem.

Let in these 240,000 and each year another emergency will arise completely undermining the safeguards of our immigration law.

The report also states that some of these refugees are "unwelcome on political grounds." Could it be because of their previous Communist affiliations? What other political grounds could make them unwelcome?

Gradually unemployment is being felt in some parts of our country. The entrance of 240,000 "expellees" will be a great shock to American wage earners, particularly to the laboring groups.

Why—if there is such an excess of population in these foreign countries—aren't these men serving in the NATO forces rather than drafting American men while the European countries have not fulfilled their promised quotas? France refuses to draft French youth to fight in French-Indochina but it has been proposed that the NATO forces be sent there. Is it fair to draft an American who must leave his job and allow an "expellee" to come into this country and take that job when the alien's country is not furnishing troops? It is most certainly not worthy of the sacrifices of Americans fighting in Korea. While 53 nations endorsed the United Nations Korean police action, only 17 nations have sent token forces, yet they expect the United States to draft our boys while they send "surplus population" to the safety of the United States to take the jobs American boys were forced to leave.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask you a question at that point? Do you realize that the aliens that are brought here would be drafted or at least subject to draft the same as Americans?

Mrs. LUCAS. Under the displaced persons law.

Senator WATKINS. No; if they are brought to this country or if we bring in 120,000 able-bodied men within the draft age, they can be drafted just the same as any American boy, and aliens have been drafted. Thousands of them are serving now.

Mrs. LUCAS. Do you not believe, Senator, that their own countries should draft them?

Senator WATKINS. They are routed out of their own countries. They are almost waifs over there. They do not have any homes.

Mrs. LUCAS. However, if they are willing to serve, why should we take them into this country and make them citizens when they could serve just as well out of the DP camps?

Senator WATKINS. Until recently we would not let them in the Army, but we have not been able to get very many of them since they have been allowed in the Army, according to the testimony here today. Whether it was due to the fact that they were bad security risks or what, we do not know, but we do know that in this country we have better than 8 million men who could not serve even though they were physically able because of their educational failing, and a lot more of the other men were not physically able.

Mrs. LUCAS. Do you not think it would be just another reason why they should not be allowed to come into the United States, if they

were kept out because of their political affiliations? If they were kept out of the Army we would not want them here.

Senator WATKINS. The Immigration Act passed in 1952 with its stringent provisions, except as otherwise provided in this act, will apply to every one of them. Mr. Mackey of the Immigration Service has testified with respect to it in its operation. The stringent provisions of that act with respect to criminal records, subversive activities, and so forth will be in full force and effect, and the Immigration Service will probably have most of the job of screening these people on the other side.

Mrs. LUCAS. However, it says that the coordinator will make or may make his own rules.

Senator WATKINS. That may be open to interpretation. I think maybe that is a bit loose. We are studying this bill and we are glad you pointed this out.

Senator WELKER. I do not think we want to bring in 240,000 or any portion of 240,000 who are physically unfit. If they could not get in the Army here, I do not think we want them here to be a future burden on the American taxpayer.

Mrs. LUCAS. Thank you, Senator Welker. That brings to mind the testimony yesterday of the gentleman from Italy when he said that 3,000 with tuberculosis were allowed to come in.

Senator WATKINS. That was lack of administration, but this bill would not permit these physically unfit people to come in.

Mrs. LUCAS. Senator Watkins will that mean another large bureau with a lot of our taxes going into paying a group of men who do all this investigating?

Senator WATKINS. It will mean some extra people if we are going to take care of 240,000 people.

Mrs. LUCAS. The checking sounds to me as if it would take a terrific staff.

Senator WATKINS. I think the administration of the displaced-persons bill was one of the black marks in our entire administrative history. I did not agree with that at all.

Mrs. LUCAS. Thank you; I agree with you.

Senator WATKINS. I hope that the election in November changed that picture and that we have some people now who will really clean up that kind of mess so that it will not happen again. I would be just as critical of the new administration doing the job as I was of the old if they failed.

Finally this committee caught up with some of the things that were being done, and got them changed toward the end. We had an administrator who did not even follow the standards.

Mrs. LUCAS. That is right; calculated risk.

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Mrs. LUCAS. I read it and I was quite interested in your statement there, Senator.

May I say that I receive mail from every State in the Union, up to 50 pieces of correspondence a day, all expressing generally the same apprehensions I have reported in the above statements. We have absolute confidence in our legislators. We know you will honorably make your decision in the best interests of the American people by whom you were elected and whom you represent. Thank you, Senator

Watkins and gentlemen, for your gracious permission to make a statement and for your courtesy.

Senator WATKINS. Are there any questions?

Senator WELKER. I would like to ask one question. If we take 240,000 under the provisions of this bill, is it your opinion that that will encourage thousands and thousands more to ask for a haven here in our country?

Mrs. LUCAS. Yes, Senator Welker, because that is absolutely implied under the International Refugee Organization report, in the United Nations book, that it will go on, that it will never end, and this would be the first wedge to undermine the law of the United States of America. We Americans are such kind and humanitarian people, but it is time to be pretty practical.

Senator WALKER. And now I want your observation with respect to the testimony this morning of the very distinguished representative, Dr. Judd, who came over here and told us if we passed this bill admitting 240,000 aliens from areas where they do not have a hot war, it would be in substance and in effect grossly unfair to the thousands of Chinese who are equally oppressed refugees and escapees who have helped us and are engaged in a fighting war. Can you give us your observations on that?

Mrs. LUCAS. I think that is absolutely true, Senator Welker. We cannot be humanitarian to part of the world and not to all of the world. That is discrimination.

Senator WATKINS. Would you be willing, if we passed the bill, to have 5,000 of them added?

Mrs. LUCAS. No, sir. I want to live up to the immigration law of the United States. I think the quota system as established back in the twenties is the one for the United States.

Senator WATKINS. I voted for the act of 1952. We cannot pass an act that is going to fit 100 percent all the way through. Do you know how many private immigration bills we have coming in continually to get around this so-called perfect act of 1952, and they are voted by every member of the Judiciary Committee, nearly all of whom supported the McCarran Act? You would be surprised to know how many thousands of them come in over the years.

Mrs. LUCAS. I have looked over about 20 of them.

Senator WATKINS. Every one of those is outside the quota.

Mrs. LUCAS. I think that perhaps the best thing for us to do is to stay adamantly within Public Law 414 and not waver.

Senator WATKINS. Most of these bills for private relief are voted for unanimously by both branches of Congress and signed by the President, and we all agree it ought to be done.

Senator WALKER. Is it not a fact that with respect to the private bills, every Senator makes his own investigation of the loyalty of this individual and the rights of this individual to come to our land?

I have not yet in my brief period in the Senate seen a private immigration bill that turned out to be a bill that would make a haven for a Communist or someone who would not deserve to enjoy the freedom of our country here. Ma, be there are some but I am just saying that.

Senator WATKINS. I doubt very much that the Communists have gotten in that way, but I was pointing out that no matter how perfect you think a law is, sooner or later there are exceptions to come. You cannot make a law to fit all kinds of human beings and nearly every

one of these private immigration bills to permit someone to come here has had my sympathy. I will say to Senator Welker and to the public generally that I have not been able personally to investigate the loyalty of each one of these people that I have sponsored. Other people whom I know have said they were loyal and said they were good people. Most of them I have never seen and I take it for granted with the number that come into a State like New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and probably California, that very few of the Congressmen or Senators ever see the people that we introduce these bills for. Yet we have every reason to believe they are all right because they are vouched for by people whom we know. That, of course, is all well and good that we should have that concern, but what I am trying to bring to your attention, and for the purpose of this record, is that situations do arise in spite of the esteem in which we hold an almost perfect law, that force us to go beyond it.

I think the McCarran Act is a good bill. I think it is the best law we have had up to this time.

We have had a situation develop, particularly in the cold war itself, when the Commander in Chief has said that we have to do certain things, and that we are struggling for our existence. He has information, which I do not have and I do not think any member of the committee has in suggesting that the admitting of these refugees would be a good thing to do. In effect, it is just multiplying what we do individually a good many thousand times, but it tries to alleviate a much bigger situation than we try to handle in the private immigration bills. I wanted to get that in the record.

Mrs. Lucas. Senator, how will this help us?

Senator EASTLAND. Could I ask you a question?

Mrs. Lucas. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Senator Watkins speaks about the cold war. The Middle East occupies a very important place in our cold-war strategy and there are thousands of real expellees there. Do you think this bill is a discrimination against the Arabs?

Mrs. Lucas. I had not considered that point, Senator. It does not mention Arabia, does it? That would be discriminatory then against Arabia.

Senator WATKINS. If it would be corrected and some of them were allowed in, and the same with the Asiatics, would you favor it?

Mrs. Lucas. It is a discriminatory bill.

Senator EASTLAND. If you take 5,000 Chinese out of the millions over there, you are still discriminating against them. If you take a handful of hundreds of thousands who are expelled, it is still discriminatory.

Mrs. Lucas. Yes. There are hundreds of thousands living in tents on the desert now.

Senator WATKINS. Many Arabs do not want to come.

Mrs. Lucas. The United Nations has debated it since 1951 and nothing has been done.

Senator WATKINS. And the United Nations and the United States helped the nations that drove them out. I personally would not object to bringing in a few of those if they want to come, but we understand they do not want to come, and the Asiatics are pretty much the same way.

Senator EASTLAND. Your answer is that it is discriminatory against the Arabs?

Mrs. LUCAS. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. I ask you if you would feel differently about it if they were included?

Mrs. LUCAS. I still say that our organization adamantly backs the quota system of Public Law 414.

Senator WATKINS. You would not admit that any emergency might change your attitude; even if your law were kept in as a permanent policy, you would not favor anything that would try to correct the present situation?

Senator WELKER. She asked you a question. How would this bill help?

Senator WATKINS. I will say, Senator, that I do not care to deliver a speech on it.

The record is filled with statements of Secretaries and the Commissioner of Immigration plus numerous other witnesses, who have testified in favor of it. I do not care to repeat the record. I will just say for your answer, please read the record.

Senator WELKER. I certainly shall read the record.

Senator WATKINS. I was speaking to the witness. I am not worried about you reading the record.

Mrs. LUCAS. Our foreign aid has now built up Europe to where it is producing 143 percent of what it produced in 1939. The combined indebtedness of the NATO countries is not as great as the national debt of the United States of America, and I think they should shoulder a little of their own burden.

Senator WATKINS. You would not get any argument out of me on that. I am one of the fellows that has been fighting that for years.

I am one of the few men who, at the time the President sent our troops into Korea, even prior to the United Nations requesting it, denounced his action as a violation of the Constitution of the United States. I would have been very happy to have had some support at that time, but nearly everybody was either tongue-tied or went along with him.

Mrs. LUCAS. Senator, you asked a moment ago about taking these men into the United States Army. My husband was one of the first Air intelligence officers in Africa in World War II. These boys know them so well. They know their families. Their mail was screened. I had a brother in CIA. They know all of those men and the difference between screening those people to allow them to come into this country and having them under the control of Army intelligence is terrific. That probably is the reason that so many have been turned down, because the Army, the Air Corps, and the Navy are so cautious. I know that my husband felt that most of those boys were almost his family because he knew them so well. He could spot a subversive; and they were never put in a responsible position.

Senator WATKINS. Are you speaking of some we took from behind the Iron Curtain or are you talking about aliens from this country?

Mrs. LUCAS. This was in World War II and you were mentioning the troops, the 505 who were in the American Army, and how would that be different.

Senator WATKINS. And they had applied and were finally taken from these refugee camps.

Mrs. LUCAS. Yes, sir; but having them under Army surveillance by the intelligence would be so different from, say, an hour of investigation or a few days of investigation.

Senator WELKER. I might say, if the chairman will permit me, to supplement what you just said, when I was a younger man practicing law in Los Angeles I knew a man very well. I thought he was one of my intimate very close friends. Before he entered the service I gave him a high recommendation to the armed services. Much to my surprise within a matter of weeks that man was caught as being a member of a subversive group and he was placed in a camp where he certainly could not harm anyone. I was glad, but I pay tribute to the Army intelligence for their fine work in that respect.

Senator WATKINS. The Army intelligence and the intelligence forces as a whole have done a fine job. I have a son who was a member of one of the armed intelligence forces in Italy during the war and took an active part.

Mrs. LUCAS. Then you know what a good job they are doing.

Senator WATKINS. I know that and I am not arguing with you on the basic principles underlying the McCarran Act, and I have gone one step further than probably most of you have. I voted against the North Atlantic Pact because they would not provide the constitutional right of the people to make the decisions. I took a stand against the Korean war and I have never had to apologize for it yet.

Mrs. LUCAS. No, sir; not to me.

Senator WELKER. I might say he has been one of the wheel horses.

Mrs. LUCAS. We have absolute confidence in you gentlemen.

Senator WATKINS. I want you to know that I do not apologize as the sponsor of this bill. I genuinely and sincerely believe it is a move in the right direction. While I do not like to do it any more than I like to draft men into the Army, or to tax people, so we can send our boys into foreign nations, I still feel it is a thing we have to do. I think it is something we ought to try and I do not think it can do half as much damage as some of the things we are doing that practically everybody in the Congress votes for.

Mrs. LUCAS. I think that would be the first time I have ever disagreed with you, Senator Watkins.

Senator WATKINS. It is nice to have some things we agree on. We are very glad to have you here and we thank you for your statement.

Senator Welker, will you take over? I have to step out for a minute.

Senator WELKER (presiding). The next witness will be Peter Wagner, president of the United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc.

STATEMENT OF PETER WAGNER, PRESIDENT, UNITED FRIENDS OF NEEDY AND DISPLACED PEOPLE OF YUGOSLAVIA, INC.

Senator WELKER. Will you state your name and your residence, please?

Mr. WAGNER. Peter Wagner, president of the United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Senator WELKER. Very well, you may proceed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee, I should first like to express my sincere appreciation to this committee

for this opportunity to express the views of the members and friends of our organization in favor of S. 1017, introduced by Mr. Watkins, in providing for the issuance of 110,000 visas to escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria.

United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc., was formed on May 6, 1946, for the purpose of furnishing voluntary aid and shelter to the needy and displaced people of Yugoslavia. Its membership, with almost no exceptions, is composed of American citizens who had themselves migrated some time in the past from the northern portion of Yugoslavia, from the regions known as Backa, Banat, and Srem, otherwise known as Vojvodina, or had relatives or friends there at the outbreak of the Second World War. This section of Yugoslavia was formerly a portion of Hungary, prior to the First World War, and subsequent to the end of that conflict, was made a portion of Yugoslavia. Its inhabitants were of German ethnic origin, and were included in the group commonly termed "expellees," which people we are primarily concerned with and to assist in whose immigration we were duly registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid and accredited by the Displaced Persons Commission.

It is with respect to this group, the expellees, that I shall limit my remarks, although I have no doubt that the facts concerning their plight, the numerous hardships which they have endured, their flight or mass expulsion from the lands of their forefathers are already matters of record before this committee.

Indeed, support for any measure designed to alleviate their distress may readily be found in the final recommendations of the Displaced Persons Commission and in the recommendations of Presidents Truman and Eisenhower urging emergency legislation to permit immigration of a reasonable number of expellees to the United States to provide them with a haven of refuge and as America's contribution to the free world's struggle against the forces of darkness and oppression.

I might add that since May 6, 1946, our organization has forwarded 16,550 packages of food and clothing to displaced persons, refugees and expellees and has endeavored to assist in the immigration of deserving persons under section 19 of the Displaced Persons Act and has performed other voluntary acts of mercy all from the voluntary contributions of our members. I mention this fact only to show that we have endeavored, as best we could, to perform more than lip service in aid of distressed persons abroad.

I can state, from personal knowledge, having been born in the same region of Yugoslavia from which expellees from that country came, and from the knowledge of members of our organization, that these expellees from Yugoslavia are hardworking, skillful, and industrious, and of good moral character, church-going and God-fearing. The majority of them are skilled agriculturists and the women are fastidious housekeepers and qualify in every manner of domestic work, in which occupations there exists a drastic shortage in the United States.

It is well known that among the expellee group as a whole there are large numbers of skilled farmers and I understand that ECA,

In the course of its study of overpopulation in the western zones of Europe, confirmed the existence of large numbers of farmers among the expellees. This is particularly true of expellees from the Danube River Valley which was famed for its reputation as "the breadbasket of Europe."

I should like to emphasize that these expellees of German ethnic origin have suffered hardships which are comparable with those endured by the most unfortunate victims of the recent conflict. In 1949, I spent 7 weeks in Germany and Austria visiting expellee and displaced persons camps in the company of Mr. Lucas Muller, one of our organization's directors, and had ample opportunity to observe firsthand the miserable conditions under which persons of German ethnic origin were living in those 2 countries.

On February 9, 1951, at the suggestion of the Displaced Persons Commission, I again visited Germany and Austria and spent 3 months visiting expellee camps and conferring with local expellee and refugee groups and again studied the working and living conditions of the German ethnics. At the time of my last visit, from information I obtained from local relief groups, I can state that there were still 1.5 million expellees living in old and dilapidated barracks, 2 million living in basements, and an additional 2 million living in attics.

In Western Germany, there are at least 250,000 German ethnic farmers with no opportunity to work and the same conditions exist among farmer families in Austria. I can assure you, from my personal observations, that these are fine people, would make fine immigrants and loyal American citizens and their one desire, the one great hope which sustains them is that they may some day have a piece of land to work and that, in America, for some of them, lies the realization of that great dream.

Of the 800,000 German ethnics in Yugoslavia prior to the Second World War, there are today some 800,000 of them, most of these people having no other occupation but farming, in Germany and Austria.

While great credit is due to the Western German Federal Republic for the progress made in the integration of expellees, the conclusion is inescapable that the vast numbers of expellees burdening the economy of Austria and Germany present a grave social, economic, and political emergency in which the United States is vitally concerned.

Although the expellee problem, involving as it does, variously estimated numbers of peoples from 10 million to 14 million, constitutes the greatest single group of uprooted persons in the world, the immigration of these people to the United States has been most difficult.

To begin with, the constitution of the IRO specifically states that persons of German ethnic origin were not of its concern. Under the Presidential directive of December 22, 1945, dealing with the admission of displaced people to this country, persons of German ethnic origin were classified as Volkdeutsche and denied admission to this country. Later when it looked as if some expellees would be admitted under the Presidential directive of December 22, 1945, the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was passed authorizing the entry of 12,000 people of German ethnic origin born in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia into this country each year for 2 years.

This act required a new registration of German ethnics for whom affidavits of support had already been filed and renewed for years, by sponsors in this country.

The amendment of the Displaced Persons Act in 1950, while it increased the numbers of persons of German ethnic origin who could come into this country to 54,744, by July 1, 1952, and also provided for payment of the expellees' fare by the Displaced Persons Commission, nevertheless involved an additional delay because of the different procedure which was adopted in that the old registration system under the Department of State for expellees was abandoned and it was thereafter necessary for the sponsors to file an assurance of a home and a job for the prospective immigrant and the assurances under the amendment of 1950 were processed in the order of the filing of the assurances.

The above facts regarding the difficulties experienced by sponsors of expellees in bringing their loved ones to the United States are cited to show that it is entirely possible that a deserving expellee applicant and sponsor may have first filed for a visa to unite themselves in this country many years ago and are still waiting to do so but, unluckily, were not picked among the 54,744 expellees who came under the program. At the termination of the expellee program under the Displaced Persons Commission, there were still 32,000 expellees in the pipeline who did not come to this country because no further visas were authorized, and we earnestly recommend the attention of this committee to these persons.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee, most of the German expellees have had a taste of communism. It was due to the evil purposes of communism that they lost all their belongings and everything that was dear to them. They fled or were driven into Western Germany and Austria like cattle, with not as much concern for their lives as we exercise for our family pets. Their lot in the free world has been a most difficult one. They form what I believe is best described as "the masses of dispossessed and the victims of man's inhumanity to man." But—it is most important for us to remember that despite all their hardships, deprivations, and the deaths of their dear ones, they still believe in and stand staunchly by our western culture and ideals. Their one great hope is for a better and free world in which they will have an opportunity to participate on an equal basis in the civilization of which they are a part. It is clearly in our best interests to see that they do not lose hope in the integrity of western civilization to eventually find a solution to their problem.

They are already wedded to American ideals and principles for, as there are millions of expellees of German ethnic origin, there are also vast numbers of Americans of German ethnic origin who have shown by their distinguished services on both our fighting and home fronts their devotion to American institutions.

I am sincerely of the opinion that if we take just the token numbers of expellees which S. 1917 proposes to do, we shall give a tremendous uplift to the hopes of millions of others among the dispossessed. Such action will be a clear sign that our Government and our people have not forgotten the expellees and are willing to bear their share in the great humanitarian task of achieving their salvation.

The admission of 110,000 escapees and German expellees provided for in S. 1917 "within the framework of the immigration laws" as

so succinctly stated by President Eisenhower in his message of April 22, involves no relaxation of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and leaves the burden upon the prospective immigrant to show that he is worthy of admission to this country and to participate in the rights and privileges of loyal, American citizenship—a burden that I am sure immigrants and sponsors alike will cheerfully and proudly accept.

I respectfully commend S. 1917 to your favorable consideration. Thank you very much.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Wagner, you were born in Yugoslavia?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Senator WELKER. When did you come to this country?

Mr. WAGNER. In 1921.

Senator WELKER. Keep in mind I know very little about immigration, certainly very little of Yugoslavia. Is it a fact that not so many years ago Tito was a strong advocate of Stalin and the Soviet conspiracy?

Mr. WAGNER. That is right.

Senator WELKER. And he broke with Stalin?

Mr. WAGNER. This I do not know. I do not know if this is true or not.

Senator WELKER. Of course from what we read in the papers, he broke.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Senator WELKER. However, he still advocates socialism; is that correct?

Mr. WAGNER. That is right.

Senator WELKER. How about these proposed expellees? Do you know whether or not they believe in our principle of free enterprise?

Mr. WAGNER. I know under the present conditions as they are in Austria and in Germany, there is no place for them so that they can exist over there. Most of them are farmers, and there is no farming in Germany and Austria, and I know they would fit in our economy here in the United States.

Senator WELKER. Farming is free enterprise. Your people, the Yugoslavs, as I understand from what knowledge I have, love the land. They love ownership of the land.

Mr. WAGNER. That is right.

Senator WELKER. Do you think they would come here and be farmworkers and work for someone else?

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, yes.

Senator WELKER. Are you familiar with the military missions that have been sent over to our country by Tito in the last few years?

Mr. WAGNER. No, I am not familiar with that.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever heard or have you ever read that 50 percent of at least 1 mission were Communist Soviet agents?

Mr. WAGNER. I saw some of it in the papers. I had the pleasure 2 years ago to be in Yugoslavia.

Senator WELKER. How many Yugoslavs, the people that you represent, would come here under S. 1917?

Mr. WAGNER. Well, there are many still in Germany. If they would be allowed to come here, maybe 90 percent would come.

Senator WELKER. You do not have any idea about what the number would be?

Mr. WAGNER. We would still have about 800,000 refugees in Austria, Germany, and in the western zones.

Senator WELKER. How would it be possible to screen these Yugoslav expellees who have come from behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. WAGNER. They were screened, you know, during the last 2 or 3 years when they come in as German expellees. They were screened. They were screened by the State Department and by the Immigration Service.

Senator WELKER. Would we have a chance to go into Yugoslavia and check up on their background?

Mr. WAGNER. I am not speaking about Yugoslavia. I am speaking about the expellees in Austria and Germany.

Senator WELKER. That is what I mean, but they originally were expellees from Yugoslavia.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Do you know whether or not our agents would be able to go into Yugoslavia and inspect their records and the background of these individuals, or would Tito permit that?

Mr. WAGNER. This I do not know.

Senator WELKER. Are you in favor of the McCarran-Walter Act?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Do you think it was fair when they allowed you something like 933 per year to come in under the quota system?

Mr. WAGNER. We believe in the quota. We believe in the load.

Senator WELKER. You are glad to get 933. You want more, of course. That is a fair assumption. You have told the committee about many of these people being farmers. I will ask you if it is a fact, Mr. Wagner, that if these people were put out in the Midwest and Far West on farms, is it not perfectly natural to assume, they would migrate back to people that spoke their language and people who worship like they do?

Mr. WAGNER. We still have some people who came in under the Displaced Persons Act. We have some in North Dakota, in Wisconsin, and in the State of Washington. We have some people all over the country.

Senator WELKER. Not so many, though.

Mr. WAGNER. There were not too many who came in. Of the 54,000 about 31 percent came from Yugoslavia.

Senator WELKER. It is a fact that most of the Yugoslavs who came in in 1948 did go back to centers where they could meet with their own people who spoke their language, who worshipped with them, and they visited each other and lived as any person would want to do.

Mr. WAGNER. Under the Displaced Persons Act they sent people to farms in a certain section. If they would send some more families of the same origin, they would stay there because they would have friends there to come together, but as to a single family, I would say, in a section where they have no friends and they cannot speak to anybody, it is sometimes a hardship. However, if they have some other families with them, they get together and slowly they pick up English and they mix with the rest of the Americans.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Wagner, I happen to be, in addition to an attorney, a farmer. I doubt very much if we could take many of the Yugoslavs or any other particular escapees from different countries and get the large group that could get along together, visit together,

and have their social life together, especially when it would probably be impossible for them to own their own land and who will have to work for someone else.

Mr. WAGNER. In Germany most of them have to live on relief, and also Austria. They get 68 marks a month from the German Government. They have to live on relief. That is not a sound condition over there.

Senator WELKER. You say they are on relief?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes. If they do not have any jobs or any work, the Government gives them something like social security over here.

Senator WELKER. That social security is quite attractive to them, naturally.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Senator WELKER. In the event of a depression or recession, especially if our boys come back home and look for work, and they must have work, it is quite likely that some of the Yugoslavs and the others under this bill might have to go on relief; is that correct?

Mr. WAGNER. Maybe.

Senator WELKER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WAGNER. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. I have none. Thank you very much for your testimony.

We have as the next witnesses Mr. L. H. Pasqualicchio and Judge Juvenal Marchisio. Which one of you gentlemen desires to speak first?

Judge MARCHISIO. Mr. Pasqualicchio has kindly and generously shared his time with me, and since I have to return to New York I will speak first.

Senator WATKINS. State your full name, your address, and occupation or profession, and in what capacity you appear here today.

STATEMENTS OF JUDGE JUVENAL MARCHISIO, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ITALIAN IMMIGRATION; AND L. H. PASQUALICCHIO, NATIONAL DEPUTY, ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA

Judge MARCHISIO. My name is Juvenal, J-u-v-e-n-a-l, Marchisio, M-a-r-c-h-i-s-i-o. I reside at 967 74th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. I am a justice of the Domestic Relations Court of the City of New York, and I appear here as national Chairman and on behalf of the American Committee on Italian Immigration, with national headquarters at 51 East 51st Street, New York City.

Senator WATKINS. Will you identify your friend for the record as well?

Mr. PASQUALICCHIO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to forego reading my statement.

Senator WATKINS. Will you please give us your name, address, and occupation?

Mr. PASQUALICCHIO. Leonard H. Pasqualicchio, national deputy of the Order Sons of Italy in America, Washington, D. C.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed, Judge Marchisio.

Judge MARCHISIO. Mr. Chairman and members of the body, my first impulse is to express my appreciation for this opportunity to be heard. I have submitted a formal memorandum which states the reasons

why the committee that I am privileged to represent, which in itself represents the thinking of some 5 million or more Americans of Italian origin, is in support of the Senate bill presently under consideration. I should like to add without referring to the memorandum the following thinking:

That we feel that here in America we are the custodians of the valued treasury of good will to men that must be transmitted into tangible and substantial form by America's leadership in making possible the migration of surplus populations of the world from those countries that are land-rich and man-poor.

Two Presidents of the United States, 1 a Democrat and 1 a Republican, both have sent special messages to Congress for emergency legislation. It is only in that manner that the United States may be able to establish leadership in a worldwide program of resettlement of Europe's unabsorbable populations.

You gentlemen know better than I that at the Brussels Conference where some 27 nations of the free world were assembled it was the thinking there that the only basis for economic security of Europe and for a successful fight against communism would be to give those people an opportunity to have a chance in life.

This bill means that approximately 120,000 immigrants a year would be permitted to enter this country and would set the example to those other nations who will follow us as they have followed us since we have assumed the leadership of the free world.

In the memorandum that I have submitted I have analyzed our manpower needs in this country, and we base our support of this bill, not on humanitarian and charitable reasons alone, but on the national interest and security.

It will permit 240,000 people carefully screened, carefully evaluated for our own manpower needs, and will mean that our population, which is now arriving at a stable plateau, will receive that additional manpower that our former Secretary of Agriculture, and those competent today in the present administration, say is needed for the future of America.

All the UNRRA plan, the Marshall plan aid, ECA aid, can never solve the problems of overpopulation. They are just shots of morphine in the arm that dull the patient's suffering but do not cure the malady. Every 100,000 people we permit to enter into this country, that is equivalent to giving to that country that suffers from surplus population and which is now the recipient of our aid, \$1 billion in pure relief. I could go on indefinitely, but I committed myself to 5 minutes. The other arguments are found in the memorandum.

Mr. ARENS. Are you familiar with S. 1766? That is the bill that was introduced by the Senator from Utah to create the Office of Commissioner of Refugees to make studies of migration potentialities of all the world.

Judge MARCHISIO. In general.

Mr. ARENS. What is your overall appraisal of that bill and that purpose, in general?

Judge MARCHISIO. Any purpose that has for its objectives the lessening of the burden of overpopulation and consequent unemployment in any country is good. But today we face a very critical time. I specifically have Italy, which is facing a crucial election on June 7, in mind. It is psychologically important that as soon as possible the

people of this country, which are on the easternmost frontiers of free enterprise, understand that we are willing to assume the leadership, not to take them all in, but to assume the leadership so that other countries may be persuaded by our example to follow it and give them an opportunity to work.

Senator WATKINS. Any questions?

Senator WELKER. Yes, I have some questions.

Are you in favor of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, Judge?

Judge MARCHISIO. I categorically am not in favor of it because in my thinking it bases the qualifications of those who wish to migrate to this country not upon the inherent worth of the individual, not upon the need of this country for special services, but upon the accident of birth. That, in my considered opinion, is not sound, democratic, American principle. It is my thinking that that has done more damage to the prestige of the United States and has destroyed more good will than all the billions that we funneled into impoverished Europe since the close of the last world war have created. But with no cost to ourselves and with great profit to our economy, we need in this country granite workers, skilled needleworkers, beetgrowers, and a host of other trades that we are unable to produce at the present time, and our industries, some of them, are stagnating because of the need.

The surest proof of that is that the two great labor unions, both the CIO and the AFL, the various divisions under them, have repeatedly stated that they are in favor of emergency legislation to permit entry of nationals of the countries that I have mentioned who are allied to us in NATO, who are good enough to be allied with us, to work with us, if necessary to fight with us, and die with us. But apparently they are not good enough to live with us, even within the needs of our own economy.

Senator WELKER. Notwithstanding the fact that there were granted 4,600, or something like that?

Judge MARCHISIO. The McCarran-Walter bill, which permits approximately 5,600 Italian nationals, of which only approximately 50 percent may enter because of various restrictions, as compared, say, with the sixty-six-thousand-some-hundred that are allocated to Great Britain, which has an equivalent population to Italy, a Great Britain that has never used one-third of the total number of migrants it may send to this country, a Great Britain that today has a manpower shortage, and understandably so. If a Britisher migrates, he goes to Canada, New Zealand, or Australia, among his own. We say certainly this bill permitting some 75,000 Italians, together with the other nationals, will fill in that gap of lack of manpower that we are receiving from Europe which our Congress in 1924, when it said that 153,000 people were needed from Europe for cultural and other reasons, will help fill that gap which is now an aching void. As I say, with great economy to ourselves, too. If we look at the various States of the United States you will find that where there is a foreign-born population, contrary to belief, there is a greater area per capita income than in those States that have fewer foreign born. In my own State of New York, where our foreign-born population is 22.8 percent, our per capita income is \$855 per year, as compared to Mississippi, where the foreign-born population is 3.3, and the per capita is \$300. In Massachusetts, 20 percent foreign born, and per capita income is \$815 per year, and that includes the preschool child, the high-school child, the

college boy, the housewife, and the indigent. Compare that with Tennessee, which is a rich agricultural State, that has 0.4 percent foreign population and \$315 income. You can go into the Midwest. You can go to Michigan.

Senator WALKER. Is it your testimony that there is a shortage of manpower in the United States today?

Judge MARCUSIA. There is a shortage because we today in some industries, as you know, cannot develop, expand, and some are receding. Take the garment industry, which is one of our large industries in the city of New York. While we have schools that have cost millions of dollars that graduate students that are capable of doing excellent work on machines, we find no skilled needleworkers. That applies, too, to the great clothing centers of the city of Utica and Rochester in the State of New York. Then there is the marble industry, tile setting, the barber industry, the chef unions. Labor certainly is jealous of the prerogatives and privileges it has obtained after so much struggle. If labor says that they welcome this additional manpower, I feel that that is a fair judgment.

Senator WALKER. You are referring to the labor leaders?

Judge MARCUSIA. Precisely.

Senator WALKER. The man that is put out of a job is not so happy about it. I can tell you, Judge, that in my State, we have hundreds, I believe thousands of fine, loyal Italian people who have come to help us in our giant mining industry. There are thousands of these people unemployed today. They are destitute. They are on relief. I wanted to bring that to your attention. You are bringing up the needleworkers and a few things I am not familiar with. I am giving you a few examples of the shortage of manpower in reverse. In Idaho, and I think in the distinguished chairman's State, where many of our mines have been closed, we cannot use them.

Judge MARCUSIA. May I respectfully submit with reference to that particular question, that in every industry, at specific times, there is always a diminution of employment. But from that alone, one cannot draw the general conclusion that there is a surplus or an abundance of manpower. I speak particularly, let us say, of agriculture. In our own State of New York an analysis made by our own State government shows that 3,142 farms were closed during the past year for lack of people willing and able to tend them. You know better than I, sir, that within the last 9 years the farm population has retrogressed in the United States exceeding 8 million. In our own State, and this may seem impossible to believe, the average age of our farmers is 60, and I understand throughout the United States it approximates 60 years of age. We have less than a 15 percent total agricultural population to supply all the United States. Despite our great mechanical achievements that have made possible the raising even of surplus crops, this cannot continue. Italy has a 45 percent agricultural population. They are good workers, hard workers. In the memorandum I set out, if you will have an opportunity to note it, in the various fields of agriculture and other industries where Italians particularly, as well—my brief is not limited to Italians, but being the representative today of the American Committee I emphasize it. But what I say applies with equal force to the other countries contemplated in the bill.

Senator WELKER. Judge, I was impressed with your opening remark referring to the surplus population in all of Europe. I can safely say that Europe is overpopulated to the extent of about 80 million people. Is that correct?

Judge MARCHISIO. The last figures I saw, and when the chairman of this committee presented the bill to his distinguished conferees, was that there are some 30 million surplus people that need assistance right now.

Senator WATKINS. I think there were 30 million refugees in the world today, and 80 million surplus or excess population in Europe itself that ought to be moved in order to leave a decent standard of living for those who stay.

Senator WELKER. Every year, I am informed, your surplus population is increasing to the extent of 3 million.

Judge MARCHISIO. I assume we are speaking of free Europe. In Italy we have a condition of some $2\frac{1}{2}$ million totally unemployed, 2 million partly employed by the efforts and sacrifices of the De Gasperi government. In Italy her population rate is steadily approaching the point that within 10 years there will be no increase. The death rate in Italy at the present time is nearly equal to the birthrate, and the difference is 325,000 people a year, which is less than the increase of birthrate over death rate in the United States, or even in France.

Senator WATKINS. We have an annual increase here of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ million.

Judge MARCHISIO. Which is higher in proportion than the Italian birthrate. This measure certainly will not cure the overpopulation question in Europe.

Senator WATKINS. It is not intended to. We know it cannot be done.

Judge MARCHISIO. But it will have a tremendous effect in bolstering up the morale of those who are associated with us in the defense of that common heritage which we prize, in the defense of free enterprise. The value will be incalculable, and cannot be contained even in hyperbolic figures in a money sense. It is the psychological effect.

Senator WELKER. Judge, as I understand your statement on surplus population, you made the remark that these people also are permitted to come to a country which is land rich and man poor. I should say to you that very few Italians are farmers in my State. We find this, and perhaps the Italians find it, that Italians prefer to go to large centers where they can visit, and talk their own language, be with their own group, which is a perfectly natural reaction.

I am somewhat alarmed about this election business that has been brought into the matter. At the last elections you had, 40 percent of the population of Italy voted the Communist ticket. Is that correct?

Judge MARCHISIO. Approximately, sir. I haven't the exact figure. And in this election the danger arises from the Communist propaganda, as you probably know much better than I, that America has failed to take the leadership in making possible the movement of people. In our own little way, our committee, we were down at the Dominican Republic last week. There they tell us that if we obtain proper safeguards they will permit 100,000 Italians to migrate there with land grants and houses, the contracts and assurances and safeguards which we must insist upon being prepared. But we must set the example to other countries. In 1924 we first wrote into legisla-

tion what I consider a racial concept, a concept that was followed after all, and which was quoted by Hitler in his address to the German Parliament as validity for his theory of racial supremacy. Certainly the admission of the few that are being asked cannot affect our economy adversely. As regards your very pertinent question about the natural tendency of these people to migrate to urban centers, I think that with fair precautions, guaranties of employment, affidavits of responsibility wherein they might be sent back, that could be avoided. Certainly you cannot take a refugee who has been in a training camp for years, and who is an urban citizen, an urban resident, and place him on a farm and expect him to be a farmer. You must take a farmer and place a farmer on a farm. That is a part of the *modus operandi* of the law.

Senator WELKER. Someone is going to be out of a job, though, when these American boys come back home.

Judge MARCHISIO. May I say this: After every war there is a period when all of these boys must set up their own homes, so many of them are married and their wives and children are living with relatives. It has been the experience that after war there always is an upsurge. The number that we are permitting to enter, should Congress in its wisdom pass this legislation, is so insignificant. It is less than the number of refugees that came here under the act of 1948. There was the same thinking. I have traveled throughout the United States, down through Mississippi, Tennessee, Louisiana, and throughout the Northwest, and I was speaking not to groups of Americans of Italian origin but of all origins. Nowhere, anywhere, have I heard of an American losing a job because of them. It costs some \$238 to the taxpayers of this country to bring these people here. To their credit, let it be said that I understand that the statistics here in Washington indicate that they have already paid to this country two and a half times the amount it cost to bring them here in income taxes alone. Some of them have developed industries that now employ many Americans who are native born.

Senator WELKER. I know what you say about the psychological effect of bringing these people here. I believe you and most everyone else will have to admit that the American taxpayers have been very kind to Italy. They have spent millions and millions of dollars to help restore a country that was once our enemy. And certainly could not that psychology be used against the Soviet psychology that "We will not take you into our arms"?

Judge MARCHISIO. It could be used, it should be used, provided the Italian Government, which is anxious to use it, would have the financial means that the Communist Party in Italy has. If you go to Rome today, you will find the entire city posted with placards bearing the Communist slogans. You will find the Christian Democratic and those parties allied with them.

And once in a while a Catholic action is posted. They have no money. The Communists seem to be rich with money.

They are using this question of migration as a means to get to these people. The Italian isn't Communist at heart. But a hungry stomach does not reason. They say, "You have been allied with America. President Roosevelt said to the Italian people, 'We have pledged our help and we will keep the faith.'"

Senator WELKER. Certainly the Italians can see. They can see what we did for them. They do not need any posters for this.

Judge MARCHISIO. But there is need immediately to counter propaganda. The poor little peasant up in the hill town who can barely read and write, he does not know, unless someone goes there to tell him. The Government needs the money to do it. Certainly if the Congress should act promptly on this, it will have a most decisive effect in making possible what is important to us, the continued association in the free world of a country of 47 million people that certainly will bear the first impact of any war with communism.

Senator WELKER. I have heard it said by reliable people that this Communist threat will exist from 10 to 30 years. And you have heard the same thing. Naturally we are going to have elections in Italy 10 to 30 years from now. If that argument is the main argument, it might be urged that we should do this quite often. I should say to you, though, Judge, I am impressed with this fact, and something that the committee, I am sure, is concerned about that we have in Italy a way to screen the man who might come to our shores. We have the very powerful church. We have a country that is friendly to us, that will give us the record, and we can get information. I believe, in fairness to you, I should say that because it is a wholesome thing. You have heard in the examination that perhaps some of us are being a little alarmed about not being able to get the right people from behind the Iron Curtain. We would have no way of getting their record or their history other than their own testimony. I know you are short of time, Judge. I certainly appreciate your appearing here.

Judge MARCHISIO. May I be permitted to say I concur full-heartedly with you, that there will be a threat of communism perhaps from 10 to 30 years. But the time and the strength of that threat depends upon the confidence that we build abroad by positive action. I certainly concur with you, sir, in your thinking, that in Italy we can be assured of a careful screening of prospective immigrants. When I first read the bill, I thought that was what the committee had in mind when it distinguished and said Italian nationals, because through that and by that this country can be assured that it will receive the type of Italian citizen, frugal, sober, industrious, God-fearing, that the country needs.

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask you this question, Judge: We have to take into consideration the state of public opinion in the United States and the state of opinion in the Senate and the House, when we present these measures. It is a practical matter. Suppose this bill were amended to include these colonists who have gone out into Ethiopia and who have been returned, and who have gone into North Africa and returned to Italy. Suppose the bill covers those mostly. Will we have opportunity there to screen them properly?

Judge MARCHISIO. There were some 540,000 people from Somaliland, Abyssinia, and so forth, that were picked up and dumped into Italy, southern Italy, already overpopulated, a group of 47 million people, in a country smaller than California, two-thirds of which has no cotton, no oil, no necessities of life; these people dumped into a country that already suffered from overpopulation, and underemployment. And it is a miracle that they were not the core of a revolu-

tion. As I said before, hungry stomachs do not reason. These people can be certainly cleared and screened, because they are displaced people in the sense that they are people who are returning to the country of their origin, not like the unfortunate German ethnics whose east Germany is no longer theirs and who are forced into Western Germany. These people were in Italian colonies where the Italian Government had control and can tell.

Senator WATKINS. They are Italian nationals now and could qualify as Italian nationals?

Judge MARCHISIO. As Italian nationals.

Senator WATKINS. And if the Congress wanted to designate that particular group to be the beneficiary of the law, there would be no objection from your organization, would there?

Judge MARCHISIO. It would be my thinking that it would be much preferable to permit the words "Italian national," and to let then the competent authorities in this country and in Italy determine which of these are best fitted and qualified to fulfill the needs of America.

Senator WATKINS. Do you mean the Italian Government or the Americans themselves?

Judge MARCHISIO. In conjunction, which are best fitted. I think the psychological impact of saying we are permitting, without changing the basic migration law, the McCarran law, without changing that because this law is apart and above. We are not discussing it at this moment, nor are we analyzing it.

Senator WATKINS. You recognize the McCarran Act is settled policy in this country.

Judge MARCHISIO. And it must be given an opportunity to see whether the defects that I honestly and personally believe it possesses are as real as I believe them to be. But in the meantime, we cannot permit our basic law to prevent us from making modifications in our own interests. If Italy goes communistic it is the thinking of those that know that France will fall immediately, Spain cannot hold out alone; all Western Europe will be lost to our type of democracy, and we will be alone, a citadel against the whole world. And whether even the United States, with its intellectual and mechanical know-how, and with the great force of the good will and the sacrifices of citizens, could stand against the whole world going Communist is unknown.

Senator WELKER. May I, Mr. Chairman, make an observation on a question you propounded to the judge. On these people that you have some doubt about. I have great faith—I am not a member of the Catholic Church—I have great faith in a man who perhaps once has been a Communist, who comes back to his church, goes to confession. That priest alone, in my opinion, pretty well can tell us whether or not that man is loyal to our way of thinking.

Judge MARCHISIO. In a very specific case that was brought to my attention yesterday, there was a man who jumped ship, because he was desirous of coming to this country, some 25 years ago. Prior to his leaving Italy he had enrolled as a young man in the Communist Party, misunderstanding its objectives. Within a period of 6 months he resigned, in writing, which information is in the hands of the FBI. He came to this country, has led an exemplary life, married here, has children who go to school here, and is a regular communicant of the church. At present his pastor and his own spiritual adviser, and the community in which he lives, are attesting that for 25 years this man

has done everything to fight communism. Yet he is, and I suppose rightly so, subject to deportation until he proves, as you indicated by those competent to know. I mean the fact that he made a mistake. We are all human and all make mistakes.

Senator WATKINS. How do you account for the increase in communism in Italy with most of the Italians being members of the dominant church there and the church taking such a strong stand against communism? How do you account for that? Will what we do over here change that situation?

Judge MARCHISIO. Italian communism is a peculiar brand of communism. They are Communists because they feel that they have nothing and perhaps this will give them a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. The moment they have a job, work, and bread, they forget communism. That, I think, explains why the Marshall plan and the ECA have done a great deal, I mean to combat communism not only in Italy but in other countries, because it gave a means of work to these people. But as your distinguished colleague said, the American taxpayers are tired of digging deeper and deeper into their pockets every year to give the necessary wherewithal to keep these countries. If we, by a gesture, an indication, open our doors a little way, other countries—Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Brazil, some of them have already started, the Dominican Republic, Canada, our neighbor to the north—they are dependent upon us today very considerably, militarily and financially; others will. After the passage of the act of 1924, some of the countries that I have mentioned wrote into their own migration law the very selfsame theory that we first propounded. If they followed us then, we may with confidence believe that today when we are the leaders, recognized, of the free world, that they, too, will follow in these footsteps, which after all, means their own salvation.

Senator WELKER. I must differ with you, Judge, on one point. If he is a good communicant of his church, he is fit to come to our land, for haven. That pot of gold that good, devout churchgoer has, and I might say a Roman Catholic in Italy, is not his food but his God. That is based upon quite an intimate relationship of many Catholic people. I have never seen a more devout group of religious people among those I happen to know and cherish.

Judge MARCHISIO. I am grateful for the remarks, sir. May I say that the Communists in Italy in their propaganda have gone so far in the elections to put the picture of St. Joseph, the Madonna, and the Infant Child and say, "Are you going to vote for these? They are Communists."

In some of the rural, in what we would call the backwoods section, but there is not much wood in Italy, in the backwoods section the people do not know. They follow. Not all of them are churchgoers. I think their religion is deep and inherent in their hearts, as you have expressed it. That is why I said Italian communism is different from other communisms. Some comment was made some time ago that we have helped Italy substantially, which we have. I was privileged with Myron Taylor to head the American Committee for Italian Relief where our people in this country voluntarily gave us \$72 million to help the orphans and the aged and destitute immediately after the World War and before UNRRA became active. Our people, throughout the United States, and I visited every sector, when it is explained

to them—I will speak frankly: When you go into some parts of the country, they will say if you let foreigners in, it lowers the standard of living. That cannot be proved because it is not a fact. They say, well, the Italians, aren't they mostly gangsters? If you pick up a newspaper and read that Angelo Bacholucia committed rape, and tomorrow you read about Batolle Mirachesia, it hits you in the eye. But if you read that John Smith or Richard Doe committed similar crimes, it does not stand out. You read a foreign name three times and say they are all gangsters. The proof is that here in Washington you have records of those who committed felony crimes in the United States. I say with a great deal of pride that Americans of Italian origin have no higher, and in many instances a lower, percentage of crime rate than people of other descents, just as more Italians in proportion to their number fought and died in the last World War for America's protection.

Senator WELKER. Is the election in Italy on June 7?

Judge MARCHISIO. June 7.

Senator WELKER. I do not know whether we are going to pass the bill through both Houses by that time.

Judge MARCHISIO. If there was only a favorable discharge out of the committee before then, it would help. It will take 72 hours before things can percolate into the hinterland.

Senator WATKINS. You understand that a very prominent member of our committee has asked that we not close the hearings until at least June 5. That presents a problem because we want to be courteous to our former chairman and member of the committee.

Judge MARCHISIO. He is a very distinguished and I hope a good friend of mine. I had the opportunity to speak to the former chairman of this committee, both at lunch and in his chambers, within the past month or so, and I admire the thinking that he has. On the way he feels, we disagree. But I know he does it because he thinks that is best for America. But it gives us all the same privilege as to what is best for America.

Senator WELKER. I think there should be some way of letting the people of Italy know that we are taking the time and talking to all of these witnesses here. It may be that the bill will not by that time be reported out favorably, but certainly there should be something that we could use to let them know that we are giving serious attention to this matter.

Judge MARCHISIO. When I say we, I refer to our committee. Immediately after the President was gracious enough to receive us and give us the words of encouragement that he did, we saw that it received full coverage in Italy, as we did his message to Congress and subsequently the introduction by the honorable chairman here of this bill. But still more must be done, and fast.

Senator WATKINS. Well, I may say that the chairman of this committee thinks he has seen the situation as it exists over there, and that is one reason why we have tried to move ahead with some dispatch. I do not want to railroad the bill, I do not want to do anything of that sort. But there is no reason why we cannot do everything we can to encourage our friends. For that reason, I set the hearings early, although I did postpone them for 2 weeks in order to accommodate the former chairman of this committee. But he has received another assignment, and he asked for further time. It is in the

record, or I would not refer to it at all today. I want to be as courteous as I can, but still there is a great issue at stake. I assure you we will do everything we can to proceed with reasonable dispatch. We cannot go ahead as fast as we would like to, as we have to give this earnest consideration in proceeding with dispatch.

Judge MARCHISIO. May I thank you, sir, for all the time you have given me. May I thank you and again refer to my memorandum where I try to speak factually and give the arguments that we feel are pertinent. May I also thank Mr. Pasqualicchio for his forbearance in letting me proceed.

Senator WATKINS. Do you want to make a statement, or do you want to file a statement?

Mr. PASQUALICCHIO. I want to make a few remarks. I know Judge Marchisio has thoroughly covered the Italian situation, but I wish to make one observation here, that we should not become alarmed over the fact that we are going to admit 240,000 additional nonquota immigrants in the United States during the coming 2 years. If you look back to the figures that have already been admitted there is a shortage in the last 6 years of about 300,000. We should be entitled under the regular quota system to 150,000 each year. During the past 6 years there have been only about 100,000 each year. So we have an unused quota total over a period of 6 years of 300,000.

Senator WATKINS. Where did you get those figures? Is that correct, Mr. Arens?

Mr. ARENS. I did not follow the figures.

Mr. PASQUALICCHIO. In 5 or 6 years we should be entitled to 900,000 immigrants at the rate of 150,000 a year, is that correct?

Mr. ARENS. No. The annual immigration into this country is not 150,000 a year. That is the annual quota limitation, the maximum. But you have to take into account your nonquota immigration which is currently running at about the same rate as your quota immigration, and under the new immigration act will increase considerably.

In the last fiscal year we took into this country approximately 265,000 immigrants, people for permanent residence, both quota and nonquota. That did, however, include certain people who were brought into the country under the Displaced Persons Act, who will be charged against future quotas. In the ensuing fiscal year we anticipate there will be an increase of 20 or 25 percent in immigration to this country under the new act.

Mr. PASQUALICCHIO. Mr. Arens, isn't it a fact that we do not use approximately 50,000 quota numbers here?

Mr. ARENS. Yes. Under the old law there was a lag in quota immigration. There will not be nearly so great a lag under the new act for several reasons, one of which is that the contract labor provision of the old law has been knocked off, and the British quota will be more heavily used, we anticipate, than under the old law. The other reason for the increase in immigration, we anticipate, will be in non-quota categories.

Under the old law, the male spouse of an American citizen was not nonquota as he is now. Under the old law, stepchildren were not given certain priorities or statuses as now. Under the old law, a spouse could not be charged to the quota of the other spouse as they are now. Under the new law, a child can be charged to either parent. The new law will actually result in a substantial increase after it gets into opera-

tion in the number of immigrants. It will not result in a substantial increase in the number of quota immigrants. It will provide a slight increase, because we have wiped out for the first time in the new law all racial barriers to immigration and have put the oriental countries on the same formula, the same pattern as the European countries.

Mr. PASQUALICCHIO. But we still anticipate that a great number of the quota numbers allotted to Italy will not be used.

Mr. ARENS. I wouldn't say a great number. There will be some in all probability; yes. But overall, immigration will increase under the new law.

Mr. PASQUALICCHIO. That was the point that I wanted to bring out. We should not get alarmed over just these 240,000, because in the next 2 years, if this bill is enacted, we will more or less accumulate unused quotas of probably 80,000 or so.

Mr. ARENS. Of course the unused quota argument is a fallacious argument for the reason that the national origins quota system did not contemplate the movement of just so many bodies. It contemplated the movement of a type of alien who would be admissible into the United States because he would be coming in a proportion to those people of a similar cultural background who are already in the country.

Mr. PASQUALICCHIO. Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very much.

(Judge Marchisio's and Mr. Pasqualicchio's prepared statements follow:)

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JUVENAL MARCHISIO ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN
COMMITTEE ON ITALIAN MIGRATION

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum is submitted by the American Committee on Italian Migration, a national organization representing the thinking of more than 5 million Americans of Italian origin, in support of Senate bill 1917 authorizing the issuance of 240,000 special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands.

Certain major facts should be considered when discussing the advisability of the passage forthwith of legislation to permit the entry into the United States, within its national needs and, of course, with due protection to its national security, of immigrants from the countries named which are associated with us in defense of the fundamental freedoms that are our heritage.

No attempt is made here to pass judgment on present policies in their historical origin or to compare critically the law presently regulating the number and type of immigrants admitted.

Senator Pat McCarran himself said on January 31, 1952: "Mr. President, one of the most serious problems which is facing the free world today is the problem of the surplus population of the free countries of Western Europe. It is a problem which is becoming increasingly more acute because of the additions to the Western European population caused every month by thousands upon thousands of refugees from behind the Iron Curtain. Although it is principally a humanitarian problem, it is likewise an economic and political problem which has a direct bearing on our efforts to strengthen the free world against Communist encroachment."

The solution to these problems cannot and should not be the responsibility of any one nation. It is an international responsibility, an integral part of the world crisis which the free nations must face together. It demands the cooperative efforts of all interested countries. But a real solution can be found only if the United States, the recognized leader of the free world, does its part and thus helps the economies of those nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so that they may fulfill their obligations in the defense of Western Europe.

The bulk of emigration needs will have to be taken care of by nations other than the United States, but our country can and must assist in the resettlement of these people. Unless the United States does something at home it cannot speak forcefully on the subject abroad.

THE FACTS

Today our growing economy can make effective use of additional manpower available in the following countries allied with us, which are suffering from a manpower clot that unless relieved will result in a Communist stroke.

Italy

Despite the fact that Italy's birthrate is lower than that of the United States, she now has 5 million more people than her present economy can hope to sustain, more than 2 million of which are totally unemployed and the balance underemployed. Included in this number are more than 600,000 returnees and refugees from her former colonies in Africa, Venezia Giulia, Dalmatia, Dodecanese Islands and from abroad. In addition Italy lost approximately 900,000 hectares of territory in Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia and approximately 350 million hectares in the colonies.

Italy's population of over 47 million (the U. N. estimate made in 1949 then fixed it at 46,001,000) is contained in a territory smaller than that of California, two-thirds of which is virtually unproductive, having no coal, iron, copper, oil, or cotton—necessities of modern living.

Germany

Since 1945 it has had to absorb in the Western Zone 7,800,000 persons of German ethnic origin who were expelled from Eastern European countries. In addition there is the dramatic story of hundreds of thousands of refugees escaping from the Eastern Zone of Germany and from those countries behind the Iron Curtain.

It is significant that the German Federal Republic reports that it will be able to maintain and employ all but 1 million of these people, predominantly farming families, that cannot be placed in its industries.

Greece

As a consequence of the guerrilla warfare in Greece, almost 700,000 people were forced to abandon the agricultural areas and to take refuge in towns.

Only 550,000 of these displaced persons have been resettled and absorbed leaving 140,000 homeless and jobless as the economy cannot provide employment for them. This represents one-fifth of the total of wage earners in the country. In addition there are 34,000 ethnic Greeks who were forced to flee Communist-dominated countries.

Holland

The Netherlands, because of the loss of its colonies, also has a grave surplus population problem.

Since transfer of sovereignty to Indonesia, some 12,500 inhabitants of the Island of Amobina have come back to the Netherlands and an additional flow of Indo-Europeans is expected.

Eighty thousand Dutch nationals were evacuated during the recent floods which, taken in conjunction with the increase of the working population averaging 50,000 per annum, it is impossible for the country to reabsorb. This means that 25,000 workers (65,000 persons including families) must, in fact, emigrate every year.

WHY WE MUST HELP

It is conservatively estimated that in the overpopulated countries of Western Europe there are at least 5 million people who, in terms of economic opportunity and resource, are considered excess.

Immediate action on this problem is essential, otherwise all the vast expenditures for armaments, Marshall plan, Mutual Security Administration, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and all other relative matters, unfortunately, may eventually be lost because financial and material aids alone are but shots of morphine which lessen the patient's suffering but do not cure the malady.

Never was there a greater opportunity than now, at no cost to us and with much profit to our economy and culture, to obtain increased faith abroad in the political and democratic strength of our way of life at a strategic point in the combat between democracy and communism.

If these people are left without hope of escape the oppressive conditions cannot be borne for long without erupting into violence of incalculable proportion. American security, to a considerable extent, depends upon Western Europe. No better evidence exists than the constant effort of the Soviet to win this vast machine shop with its trained manpower.

President Eisenhower on October 17, 1952, summarized this viewpoint succinctly when he said, "A contest for world leadership—in fact, for survival—exists between the Communist idea and the American ideal. That contest is being waged in the minds and hearts of human beings. We say, and we sincerely believe, that we are on the side of freedom; that we are on the side of humanity. We say, and we know, that the Communists are on the side of slavery, the side of inhumanity."

"Yet to the Czech, the Pole, the Hungarian, who takes his life in his hands and crosses the frontier tonight, or to the Italian who goes to some American consulate, this ideal that beckoned him can be a mirage. * * *"

EUROPEAN EMIGRATION IN RELATION TO AMERICA'S NEEDS

Current notions concerning immigration are the product of misinformation, prejudices, myths, and rationalizations and you hear much talk that the introduction of foreign-born into this country would lower our American standard of living. The facts are otherwise.

It is to be noted that our periods of greatest expansion coincided with our periods of greatest immigration. It is also not to be disregarded that those States with the largest population percentages of immigrant settlement are also States of greatest prosperity. To illustrate this point factually the following are some examples (statistics of 1940) :

State	Percentage of foreign-born	Per capita income	State	Percentage of foreign-born	Per capita income
New York.....	21.2	\$263	Mississippi.....	0.3	\$201
Massachusetts.....	19.7	766	Georgia.....	.4	315
Rhode Island.....	19.3	715	Tennessee.....	.4	317
Michigan.....	13.0	509			

These figures, as all economists agree, are no mere coincidence.

The best evidence available shows that the United States will continue to need more manpower both in agriculture and industry. Our expanding economy needs an expanding labor force. The needs of our industry especially have proved to be and will likely continue to be enormous.

Recently New York State industrial commissioner, Edward Corsi, testified that "we are suffering from a very great labor shortage in this State both on the farm and in the factory." He stated that there are 350,366 unfilled nonagricultural jobs and 4,500 unfilled farm jobs in New York State alone.

In our agriculture particularly we have need for additional people. Farm operators and farmworkers are essential in our defense effort. Since 1949 there has again been an alarmingly sharp downward trend in the farm population of the United States. With the resumption of the movement from the farms to the cities there is a real danger that in the years just ahead our agricultural production may be seriously hampered.

Our goals and sights for the future must encourage progressively higher levels of agricultural output. There are within this picture both the need and absorptive capacity of American agriculture for some augmentation of the supply of labor which a carefully liberalized policy of immigration would make available.

A rich pool of surplus farmers and farmworkers exists in the overpopulated areas discussed. Among the expellees in Western Germany there are many agricultural families with no opportunity for employment on the land. Italy has a 45-percent agricultural population and in the Netherlands there are large groups of agricultural workers who cannot find productive employment on the limited arable land available.

In considering the steps to be taken we should measure the needs of the distressed people in Europe against our capacity to make good use of additional manpower and the extent of our international responsibilities. The problem we face is in the nature of an emergency. The national labor leaders of our country have unequivocally testified and are on the record as favoring the legislation

requested. They are alarmed at shortages which exist in American industry. To name but a few: The garment industry, where the lack of skilled needle workers is critical; the marble and granite industries, where cutters are unavailable in the numbers required; the tile industry, where skilled craftsmen are desperately needed; the restaurant industry, where skilled help, particularly waiters and chefs, is virtually unobtainable. These are the particular industries in which the Italian immigrant excels, and to which can be added an almost innumerable list including architectural designers, mural painters and decorators, wood carvers, embossers, wrought-iron and stained-glass workers.

WHY ITALIAN IMMIGRANTS

(1) Over 90 percent of Americans of Italian origin reside in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Ohio, Illinois, California, Michigan, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and it is significant that these States are outstanding in the progress they have made and have the highest annual per capita income.

(2) Relief statistics demonstrate that the Italian immigrant rarely becomes a burden on the receiving country.

(3) Italian immigrants rank high among the immigrant groups in the matter of naturalization. They come, establish themselves, and become American citizens as soon as possible.

(4) Italian immigrants are frugal, sober, and industrious.

(5) A conspicuous characteristic of Italians is their provident disposition, to own the homes they live in and to deposit the surplus of their earnings for the growing need of their families and to meet future exigencies.

(6) In proportion to their numbers, a greater percentage of Americans of Italian origin served in World War II than any other nationality.

(7) The Italian immigrants' record of loyalty to the United States is unexcelled by any other ethnic group.

(8) The Italians' adaptation to and solicitude for the land is conspicuous in—

(a) The development of California's agricultural potentialities.

(b) Colorado's sugar-beet industry.

(c) The Northeastern Potato and Midwestern Wheat Belts.

(d) In truck farming.

Despite popular belief to the contrary, the record shows that in proportion to numbers, fewer Americans of Italian origin are convicted of felony crime than any other minority group.

TO SUMMARIZE

This request in support of a joint congressional resolution authorizing the President to reallocate unused quotas for the years 1950, 1951, and 1952 (totaling 208,317) or, in the alternative, a Presidential message to Congress requesting emergency legislation permitting approximately 300,000 people to enter the United States within the next 3 years over and above the present immigration quotas, is the smallest possible number that is consistent with American sincerity and desire to help the gravest problem facing Europe today.

Considered against the background of our own economy, this proposal:

(1) Will impose no hardship on anyone in the United States, not only because it provides for fewer than 1 immigrant for every 1,500 Americans, but also because America needs farm and other workers of scarce skills who, with blood relatives who are citizens, would receive first preference.

(2) Will enable America to share with other nations the solution of the problem which is basic to the peace and freedom of the world.

(3) Will add and strengthen America's prestige in Western Europe, particularly among the peoples of Germany, Italy, Holland, and Greece.

(4) Will provide an effective response to daily Soviet propaganda.

(5) Will be at least a token example which will serve to promote international migration from overpopulated countries to the other areas of the world that are land rich and man poor.

(6) Will be an act of justice to those who, subsequent to Potsdam, were ruthlessly expelled by the Soviet and fled Communist terror to strengthen the ranks of freemen.

(7) Will be an important arm of our foreign policy and will support our American propaganda abroad.

(8) Encourages the political stability and unity of friendly and allied countries and will strengthen their economies and military potential.

(9) Implements the resolution adopted in Lisbon in 1952 at the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Conference concerning the importance of emigration, particularly for Italy, but also for other countries.

(10) Recognizes that it is no accident that the country with the most serious overpopulation problem, i. e., Italy, has the largest Communist Party in Western Europe.

(11) Will have its political effect on the elections of the countries assisted and particularly those of Italy scheduled for May 31, 1953.

(12) Recognizes that the absorbability of new immigrants has been studied and that it is estimated that the United States can absorb at least 100,000 more immigrants per year above the present quotas.

(13) Will help free us from the implication of superiority or inferiority of peoples such as is inherent in the national origins quota system, without sacrificing the right of the United States to grant preference and priority.

(14) Accepts the tragic plight of uprooted people in the world as a continuing problem and the need for America's traditional policy of helpfulness in providing a haven for the oppressed.

(15) Will make use, without curtailing, of the unused quotas of those countries that fail to take advantage of the number of people they may send to the United States without changing the basic immigration law.

(16) Does not, in essence, change the national origin plan which has already been scrapped by the simple fact that 2 of the biggest quota countries, Great Britain and Northern Ireland with over 65,000 and the Irish Free State with over 17,000, are not using even a major portion of their quotas at the present time.

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY L. H. PASQUALICCHIO, NATIONAL DEPUTY OF THE ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA, FAVORING THE APPROVAL OF BILL S. 1917

Mr. Chairman and committee members; I am L. H. Pasqualicchio, of Washington, D. C., national deputy of the Order Sons of Italy in America and also chairman of our committee on immigration and naturalization.

I wish to thank the chairman and the members of this honorable committee for giving us the opportunity to appear here today and express our humble views regarding this bill S. 1917.

With immense pride and humility I wish to congratulate our great President for the deep interest he has shown in trying to relieve the serious problem of escapees now existing in several European countries. I also wish to commend Senator Watkins and his cosponsors for introducing such a wonderful bill.

While we do not believe that the solution of the problem of refugees, expellees, and overpopulation is the responsibility of any one particular nation, still we must insist that America, as the greatest and richest nation in the world, should take the leadership in an effort to aid and alleviate the misery and suffering brought about by Communist oppression and the dislocation of populations in Western Europe. By the approval of this bill, America will be doing her part together with the other free nations to improve the future of these unfortunate people.

We are confident that the admission of 240,000 nonquota immigrants into the United States, within a period of 2 years would cause no economic or social disruption to our American way of life. We believe that such a program is of paramount importance to us in our efforts to establish peace and security throughout the world.

The admission of 240,000 immigrants within a period of 2 years would not be an economic strain to America. Such a program would probably eliminate from relief roles in Europe 500,000 people yearly, because all of the immigrants admitted would immediately be given employment and become self-sustaining. They would also be able to render financial assistance to their relatives and friends abroad.

The number of immigrants admitted under this bill would not materially disrupt our immigration program. We allow by law 150,000 immigrants each year from all countries of the world, but in the past 6 years, less than 100,000 a year have been admitted legally. This situation, as we all know, is caused by the inadequacy of our existing immigration laws in having perpetuated the national origin quota system.

I wish to assure this committee of the wholehearted support of this organization. It is my humble opinion that the provisions of this bill are fair and specific and deserve the support of every peace-loving American. Highest praise

should be given to the sponsors of this bill for the fair and equitable number of visas allocated to each nation.

We must fully realize that the horrible problem of escapees drifting about in strange lands, unwanted and depending upon public charity, does not present an encouraging picture. We shall not have peace during our lifetime unless we are able to give some of these unfortunate people employment and a home. They should be given an opportunity to become self-sustaining and an asset to a community rather than a burden.

The Order Sons of Italy, being an American institution organized over 50 years ago, primarily considers the economic and social welfare of the United States. We do not wish to support or recommend anything which may prove harmful or detrimental to the future progress and greatness of America. A strong and powerful America means freedom, peace, and happiness to mankind throughout the civilized world.

Our committee on immigration and naturalization, the supreme officers, and officers and members of 2,200 lodges in 35 States of the Union, therefore, respectfully recommend to the members of this honorable committee that bill S. 1917 be given favorable consideration and order its immediate enactment.

Senator WATKINS. Miss Alexandra Tolstoy? Please come forward.

STATEMENTS OF ALEXANDRA TOLSTOY, PRESIDENT, TOLSTOY FOUNDATION; LEON NICOLI, PRESIDENT, FEDERATION OF RUSSIAN CHARITY ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES; BLAIR TAYLOR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TOLSTOY FOUNDATION; SERGE BELOSSELSKY, VICE PRESIDENT, FEDERATION OF RUSSIAN CHARITY ORGANIZATIONS; AND ANATOLE S. LOUKASHKIN, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Miss TOLSTOY. Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to list at the same time and save your time the Federation of Russian Charity Committees, Mr. Nicoli?

Senator WATKINS. Yes. We will have you together. For the purpose of the record, please give your full name, your address, and occupation or profession.

Miss TOLSTOY. Alexandra Tolstoy, president of the Tolstoy Foundation, and the Tolstoy Foundation is the authorized agency of the Russian Greek Orthodox Churches of North America, and in Europe of the Holy Synod. We represent the churches.

Senator WATKINS. You are a daughter of Count Tolstoy?

Miss TOLSTOY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. We are very happy to have you here. Now, would you kindly have your associates identified?

Mr. NICOLI. Leon Nicoli, president of the Russian Charity Organizations of the United States. We represent 27 organizations.

Senator WATKINS. Is there anyone else in the group?

Mr. TAYLOR. Blair Taylor, executive director of the Tolstoy Foundation.

Mr. BELOSSELSKY. Serge Belosselsky. I am a farmer and vice president of the Nicoli organization, the Federation of National Russian Charity Organizations.

Mr. LOUKASHKIN. My name is Anatole Loukashkin. I reside in San Francisco, at 1210 23d Avenue. I represent the group of American citizens and residents in California on behalf of their relatives now in China or Manchuria.

Senator WATKINS. Are you with this group?

Mr. LOUKASHKIN. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. I will say this: I do not think we will be able to hear from all of you. We will take two of you, Miss Tolstoy and Mr. Nicoli. Will that be sufficient? If they have a question and they have to call on you for a comment, we will not object to that. Now you may proceed.

Miss TOLSTOY. Mr. Chairman, I will speak very briefly. We are very happy, and I might say that of all the Russian colony and our organizations, we are pleased that the question of the legislation and acceptance of more refugees by the United States has been brought up by the President and has been raised in our Government.

I must say I think there are two sides to the whole question. One side is humanitarian. In the fall I was in Europe, and I saw the remains of the refugees who were stranded in those camps now nearly 8 years. Some of them did not get visas just because there were no visas at that date, at the end of the year 1951. We have quite a number of those people who did not accidentally come to this country because there were no visas over here. I would say there was another side besides the other one, the humanitarian, and that is the political side.

I look upon the refugees, the escapees, as messengers from behind the Iron Curtain. I consider that by helping those victims of communism we are forming friendly relations with the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and this is exceedingly important. We do not know what the Soviets are going to do in the case of a cold or hot war. We must form this friendship between the United States and the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Those victims of communism are not only in Europe. I see that in your bill Europe is covered. We have about 2,000 in the Middle East, some of them old refugees, some of them new refugees and escapees. The new escapees are not numerous.

Also, again, I would beg you to include in this bill the Chinese refugees. According to our knowledge, there are about 12,000 of those refugees, and this was a statement from a representative who works in China.

Senator WATKINS. Twelve thousand of which particular ones?

Miss TOLSTOY. The European refugees, mostly Russians.

Senator WATKINS. So-called White Russians?

Miss TOLSTOY. White Russians, yes. I would say that perhaps not over 8,000 would be eligible for immigration. I think if we are trying to help the escapees from behind the Iron Curtain to the West, I think we ought to help those refugees from the East.

Mr. ARENS. Madam Tolstoy, these 12,000 you are speaking of, are they in Shanghai?

Miss TOLSTOY. No, not all of them are in Shanghai. They are all over.

Mr. ARENS. How many are in Shanghai?

Miss TOLSTOY. I could not tell you the figure offhand. I know that 4,000 were registered by the IRO.

Mr. ARENS. Shanghai is under the control of the Communists, is it not?

Miss TOLSTOY. Yes. Well, I suppose all of China is under that control.

Mr. ARENS. Well, there is Hong Kong which we understand is not. At least they are out of Hong Kong.

Miss TOLSTOY. In Hong Kong, as you know, there are very few.

Mr. ARENS. There are very few White Russians there or Caucasian refugees.

Miss TOLSTOY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. The query I have in mind is if these people are in Shanghai, how would you ever contemplate documenting them, investigating them, bringing them out? I don't quite get your point on that.

Miss TOLSTOY. Only through Hong Kong, of course. Do you mean from the security point of view? Yes, from the security. You mean how we could clear them?

Mr. ARENS. No, I mean how would you ever process them. Shanghai is in control of the Communists. The red flag is flying over Shanghai, I understand.

Miss TOLSTOY. I know, but they are willing to let them go at the present moment.

Mr. NICOLL. I think I am a little closer to this question, because I am from San Francisco, and all these refugees go through our organization. In Shanghai we have now 2,350 applications already signed by relatives. Of these people who were left there, after Red China occupied Shanghai, as you know 5,000 White Russian and Caucasian population was evacuated to the Philippine Islands. We thank you very much for the special law which was supported by our Senator Knowland. But some relatives were left there. It is this group of White Russians. And we have some that live in Manchuria. Manchuria was in the Chinese Government before, and after Red China occupied Manchuria, some population left there who were refugees before from Russia, and the second time they were caught. These people arrive now at Tsien Tsien, Chefou, and Shanghai.

Mr. ARENS. Are all the people transported to Samar out, about 4,000 of them?

Mr. NICOLL. Five thousand. They are all here now. But some were left. Some of these people have relatives in Shanghai and China, and we have applications from these relatives. For some reason Red China still gives permission for visas. If some have money to go out, these people fly here. I know in San Francisco last week one lady flew direct. Her son lives over there. For some reason China still gives permission to leave Red China. How long this will be, we do not know.

Mr. ARENS. These are documented?

Mr. NICOLL. All documented.

Miss TOLSTOY. These people are in the greatest danger because any minute the Red Government will say "We will stop emigration," and then all of these people are doomed. Therefore, this is exceedingly important. In all of our agency I listen to many reports from China. We are exceedingly upset by this situation. This is the reason we are begging you to include them in the bill.

Mr. ARENS. They are not included now?

Mr. NICOLL. No, sir.

Senator WAKINS. It is entirely European.

Mr. ARENS. As I understand it, these are Europeans that are in Shanghai.

Miss TOLSTOY. That is right.

Mr. NICOLI. That is right, and they are in more danger. With 400 million Chinamen, it is very dangerous to live. There are some Russian and some Frenchmen in this group also.

Mr. ARENS. How would you develop or ascertain who are security risks in Shanghai itself? Could you help the committee on that?

Mr. NICOLI. Through connections. These people lived before in Shanghai and maybe the American service has information. We have information through relatives here, his relatives, guaranteeing.

Mr. ARENS. Is there any place else in the world where you could suggest where these Europeans in Shanghai could be transported similar to Samar? We moved a bunch of them, 4,000 or 5,000 to Samar, and then subsequently they were brought to the States.

Mr. NICOLI. I think Formosa, maybe.

Mr. ARENS. Have you worked out any kind of arrangements with Formosa to take any of them?

Mr. NICOLI. Not yet, no.

Mr. ARENS. What is being done about trying to move the people to some place like Samar or Formosa?

Miss TOLSTOY. The World Council of Churches and the Church World Services, they are also working on the problem. But I think it is very, very difficult to get visas in other countries. You know how it is.

Mr. ARENS. I understand South America is taking about 6,000 altogether of that same group. Isn't that right?

Mr. NICOLI. About 8,000. We have a big help from the National Council of Churches, big help, and I appreciate to report this to your committee, that a lot of White Russians were here, and our friends are here now.

Mr. ARENS. I think a high percentage of them would be qualitatively ineligible for admission to the United States, that is, from the standpoint of their physical condition, and age. What is your feeling about that?

Mr. NICOLI. I don't think so. Naturally some are old. But some relative is here. Maybe the children are here, or sister, or mother or father, and connected with the families who live already in the United States.

Mr. ARENS. Your organization, Madam Tolstoy, is principally interested in that?

Miss TOLSTOY. We worked on the Philippines together. We came much later into the job, the Tolstoy Foundation, because we were busy with European refugees. But if those refugees would be admitted, a certain number, we will certainly work together again on this problem.

Mr. ARENS. What do you think of the suggestion that was made here by one of the Senators to the effect that if we would go into Shanghai and take white people in the refugee category out and let the Chinese refugees look at them get on the boat and come to the United States, we would be doing more harm than good from the standpoint of the overall program unless we took a fair proportion of Chinese.

Mr. NICOLI. I don't think so, because the Chinese Government, first, does not give permission for Chinese citizens to go away. White people still can. Until the Chinese Government changes policy, they

let the white man go out. "Asia for Asiatics." This is what they are doing there now.

Otherwise, any white man now in China is not welcomed except maybe the Soviet communistic government official.

Miss TOLSTOY. May I have one more word?

Senator WATKINS. Go right ahead.

Miss TOLSTOY. I want to say that I think no one has any doubt about us so-called White Russians, our attitude to communism for years and years and years, and we screen our people ourselves, even, because any recommendation of the people we know of Russian descent is very important to us. Of course, I can't tell you for sure, but I doubt very much that among the 12,000 that the Tolstoy Foundation brought over that we had any security risks. Of course, every precaution would be taken again in the case of those Chinese refugees. As Mr. Nicoli has said, it would be through relatives, through all kinds of other Russian people, we would get information and, of course, we would be very careful in even proposing to bring any people that we would suspect of being security risks.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have anything further to offer?

Mr. NICOLI. We, as an organization, fully support the statement by the National Council of Churches, in general, only we would like it changed to 8,000 European refugees in China and Manchuria. Here it is 5,000 and we would like it changed to 8,000.

Mr. ARENS. You support the position of Mr. Roland Elliott and Dr. Van Kirk?

Mr. NICOLI. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Except that you in addition want a special allocation for your people in Shanghai; is that correct?

Mr. NICOLI. In Shanghai; yes.

Mr. ARENS. Did you want to file that statement, sir?

Mr. NICOLI. It is the same statement.

Senator WATKINS. It is the one filed by the church people.

We are very happy to have had you here, and thank you for your contribution.

(Supplementary statements of Miss Tolstoy and Mr. Nicoli follow:)

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF MISS ALEXANDRIA TOLSTOY

The Tolstoy Foundation's basic purpose is giving aid to escapees from communism and therefore it is particularly concerned with the dangers of giving unwittingly, aid to any Communist agent or sympathizer. Senator Welker's questions as to the possibility of adequate security screening of escapees are the same as those which the Tolstoy Foundation's representatives must ask themselves before sponsoring the care or migration of any individual case.

Checks can be made on applicants, both by inquiries among other earlier—and tested—refugees from the same town, and by reports which are constantly being gathered about the personnel, both civil and military, of the Soviet occupation forces in the occupied areas of Eastern Europe. This is more easily done in Germany, where several such fact-gathering organizations exist as, for example, the Free Jurists, Fighting Group Against Inhumanity, both of which are German, and the anti-Communist Russian NTS headquarters in Berlin. All these have extensive files and contacts on the far side of the curtain. They cooperate with Allied and German security, with very satisfactory results in exposing planted agents and pseudo-escapees.

Communist agents, of course, are sent across the line for local operations. They are seldom sent for long-range operations because the time element in-

volved in obtaining sponsorship, visas, clearances, etc., is so great that their value on eventual arrival is very doubtful. It is much easier and more practical to send such agents directly to the United States as part of a delegation to the United Nations.

STATEMENT OF LEON NICOLI, PRESIDENT, FEDERATION OF RUSSIAN CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, SAN FRANCISCO 21, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman and committee members: I am Leon Nicoli of San Francisco, Calif., president of the Federation of Russian Charitable Organizations of the United States.

I wish to thank the chairman and members of this committee for giving us the opportunity to appear here today and express our views regarding this bill, S. 1917.

Our Federation wholeheartedly supports the proposed bill S. 1917, providing provisions are made to take care of the plight of the groups of European refugees in China and Manchuria, the great majority of whom are the White Russian political refugees.

We believe that their approximate number is about 8,000. We have already in our files applications for admission of about 3,000 persons, signed by relatives residing in the United States.

To be admitted to this country under existing quotas, these people would have to wait for years, but their case is of extreme urgency, as they are not allowed to earn a living and outside material support is impossible. We share the views on this bill of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America and the National Lutheran Council.

We wish to express our profound thanks to the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America and the National Lutheran Council for their charitable work in behalf of the political refugees. We believe that this kind work will combat world communism more effectively than any other action.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Minkunas is our next witness.

Could you give us the highlights of this, and we will have it printed into the record as your statement. We have already heard from your same organization.

STATEMENT OF PETER MINKUNAS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UNITED LITHUANIAN RELIEF FUND OF AMERICA, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. MINKUNAS. We have about 10,000 refugees still in Europe. We are interested that they could come here to America.

Senator WATKINS. About how many?

Mr. MINKUNAS. 10,000. German expellees from Lithuania and Lithuanian displaced persons. We are taking care of displaced persons and expellees from Lithuania.

Mr. ARENS. What is your total in Baltic countries?

Mr. MINKUNAS. They have in Sweden Estonians and Latvians in a very large number. But Sweden is not included now.

Mr. ARENS. Generally in your thinking on refugees, you think of all of them from the Baltic States together?

Mr. MINKUNAS. About thirty or forty thousand, including Sweden.

Senator WATKINS. I see we have a wrong listing for you. For the record, will you state your full name, your address, and your occupation or profession, if any, and the name of the organization you represent.

Mr. MINKUNAS. My name is Peter Minkunas. I am living at 919 Glenmore Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. I am executive director of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc. I have worked 7 years for this organization.

Senator WATKINS. Go ahead with your statement.

Mr. MINKUNAS. May I read it?

Senator WATKINS. We would prefer if you could just give us the highlights. Maybe it would be just as quick to read it.

Mr. MINKUNAS. I will read the second part of it.

(The full statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY PETER MINKUNAS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UNITED LITHUANIAN RELIEF FUND OF AMERICA, INC., ON S. 1917

On behalf of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee for this opportunity to testify before it and for the opportunity to present our organization's views regarding the need for emergency immigration legislation.

The United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America renders services mostly to escapees and expellees from Lithuania.

During World War II Lithuania suffered alternate occupations by her neighbors Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. Soviet Russia still holds Lithuania in oppression and bondage. As a result of those occupations, and the inhuman terrorization of her population, more than 60,000 Lithuanians fled from their country between 1940 and 1945. When the war ended very few returned to Lithuania, because of the continued program of liquidation and deportation by the Soviets, of which they were well aware. Since the end of the war about 500,000 Lithuanians have been deported from Lithuania to Siberia. Although it is extremely difficult to escape from Lithuania at the present time, a few risk their lives and succeed in breaking through the Iron Curtain in order to gain freedom.

Historically, America has been the haven for the oppressed of other lands, and, thanks to the humanitarian attitude of the Congress of the United States regarding refugees, and its enactment of Displaced Persons Law 774 as amended, about 30,000 Lithuanians (including German ethnics born in Lithuania) have been successfully resettled in the United States. Within a short space of time they have adjusted themselves into our community life and the American economy. They have become self-supporting, and are regarded as capable, honest, hard-working and intelligent people. They have been readily absorbed by industry and by agriculture, and their children are attending high schools, colleges, and universities. The younger men are already in the armed services and some have seen service in Korea. The new arrivals did not displace Americans from their homes or jobs, nor does it appear that they have burdened the American public in any way. Lithuanian, as well as other displaced persons often express their gratitude to the United States and the American people for permitting them to emigrate to this country.

However, with the end of the displaced persons law, about 10,000 Lithuanian refugees still remain in Western Europe; 80 percent in Germany. About 2,000 had been processed as displaced persons or German ethnic expellees, but were unable to obtain visas because available quotas were filled; others were unable to obtain home and job assurances before the deadline of July 31, 1951, or were temporarily deferred due to ill health. Quite often one member of a family was temporarily in ill health and the family, wishing to emigrate together, remained until that member had recovered only to find that in the meantime the displaced persons law had expired. Also, those who fled Iron-Curtain countries after January 1, 1949, were not included in the displaced persons law.

Most of these Lithuanian refugees in Germany are living in camps, without work and without any future. They are living on the very meager relief that the German Government can ill afford to give them. The refugee situation is potentially explosive in Germany. The refugees constitute 20 percent of Western Germany's population and every day new waves of escapees increase this number. One-third of the unemployed in Germany are refugees. With diminishing migration opportunities the refugees are becoming very depressed and restless. Lithuanian refugees are convinced opponents of Communist tyranny. They have experienced it and they want no more of it. But the life in camps, for most of them since 1944, is becoming unbearable, and it is natural that most of them wish to move to other countries where they may start their lives anew.

A large percentage of the remaining Lithuanian refugees wish to come to the United States because parents, relatives or friends are here. Since about one-

sixth of Lithuania's total population is settled in the United States it is only natural that they turn to this country where their loved ones, relatives, and friends would help them to resettle.

But, according to existing immigration laws very few Lithuanians will be able to migrate to the United States in the coming years. Lithuania's quota is 386—one-half of which is already mortgaged until the year 2090. Meanwhile, 11,946 Lithuanians have registered for visas at various American consulates.

A great number of Lithuanian refugees, who are still in Western Europe, are living in hope that the United States will once again show its kind heart and will enact special legislation which will permit them to emigrate to the land of all their hopes—America, the country where victims of tyranny have always found asylum.

The bill S. 1917, introduced by Hon. Arthur Watkins, with its definition of "escapee" and "German expellee" and 125,000 special quota immigrant visas allotted to them would help a large number of refugees, among them the Lithuanian escapees and German expellees from Lithuania, to come to this country and become self-sustaining residents of our country and potential citizens.

United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., respectfully recommends the passage of the bill S. 1917.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very kindly. We will call Mr. Cassavetes. I think this will be the last witness we will be able to hear today. We are very sorry, but we try to draw a schedule for each one of these hearings. We ran into difficulty the first day. You cannot tell how long the Senators, including myself, are going to question you when you get up here. You do your part, but we get into discussions which take a long time. We have been going since 9 o'clock this morning with 1 hour for lunch.

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS J. CASSAVETES, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. CASSAVETES. My name is Mr. Nicholas Cassavetes, New York. I am a newspaper writer for the Greek newspapers in the United States. I specialize in studying immigration law and explaining it to our people in the United States. I believe that as long as the United States has taken the leadership of defending the democratic world against the forces of communism that while we are giving of our substance and of our money, we also have to alleviate the human burden of Europe.

Senator WATKINS. Will you yield for just a moment? I have to leave. I do not want to show any disrespect to you, but I shall certainly read what you say in the record and I will ask Mr. Arens to continue with your testimony. At the conclusion of your testimony we will recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

I hope the other witnesses whom we were not able to hear will overlook the fact that we were not able to hear them today.

Mr. CASSAVETES. I am not here to advocate whether a bill like that should be passed. The Senate bill should be passed. Many arguments have been adduced and I have heard them and I agree with them that the relief of the democracies of Europe should be granted in a measure by allowing 240,000 Western Europeans to enter the United States.

I want simply to remark that the number of 20,000 Greeks that I noticed the bill provides as allotment for the Greeks is a very small number. This is due to the fact that since 1924 the Greek quota, which was 3,000 per year, was cut down to 308.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you a question on that, Mr. Cassavetes?

Would you be just as happy if this bill did not take the Greek nationals as such but it took the same number of Greek refugees?

Mr. CASSAVETES. What is the difference between Greek nationals and Greek refugees?

Mr. ARENS. Only this: that the term "Greek national" could embrace people who were not refugees.

Mr. CASSAVETES. They would have to be Greek nationals; that is, we have only refugees from Russia, a few, we have a few from Bulgaria, and we have from Albania about 500 established in the northern part of Greece. These are dislocated Greeks whose homes were destroyed by the Communist invasion and they are in just as bad situation as any refugee coming from Albania or behind the Iron Curtain.

I would say since the Greeks have been put to the acid test, the First World War, the Second World War, a small nation, they stood against the Nazis, against the Fascists, against the Communists, that they are practically a unique little nation. With the exception of England, I know of no other country in Europe that out of principle stood and sacrificed themselves for democracy. Those people should be given recognition. We have starved them from the point of view of immigration because we have given them only 308 a year. I think the committee should consider giving the Greeks 30,000 out of the total allotment. That is the only point I want to make, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARENS. Now you have a prepared statement here, Mr. Cassavetes.

Mr. CASSAVETES. Yes; I have.

Mr. ARENS. Did you want at this point to insert your prepared statement in the body of this record?

Mr. CASSAVETES. Yes; I do.

Mr. ARENS. We thank you very much for your testimony and pursuant to the order of the chairman of this subcommittee, the subcommittee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning at which time we will convene here in this room.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS J. CASSAVETES, NEW YORK, N. Y.

I have already submitted to your committee a general statement with fundamental reasons for which I believe that, of the total number of 240,000 refugees and displaced persons the bill under discussion provides, your committee should recommend a minimum of 30,000 Greeks for the next 2 years.

I want to add to the reasons presented to your committee in my said statement the following additional reasons:

The Greeks had an annual quota of 3,000 from 1921 to 1924. In 1924 this annual quota was reduced to 308. From that time to this day the people of Western Europe were subjected to the acid test of devotion to the principles of democracy which approaches nearest our own American way of life.

The Greeks came out of the test with flying colors. It is well remembered how the entire people of Greece, in the face of Fascist invasion, practically led the Government of Greece into a war of resistance which covered them with immortal glory. The Greeks showed that they valued life and property less than freedom and, once again, proved that they are worthy descendants of those who defended European freedom against Asiatic invasions.

No sooner had they administered a humiliating defeat upon the Fascist legions of invasion of Greece, the Nazis poured their legions from the north and, while infinitely larger and more powerful western nations yielded to the onslaught of the Nazis, the Greeks with the bulk of their fighting forces in Albania pursuing the Fascists, amassed whatever forces they could upon the northeastern front of the Nazi invasion and there they detained the Nazis long enough to ruin their time schedule for the invasion of Russia.

Naturally, the Greeks could not, singlehanded, withstand Fascists and Nazis attacking them at the same time. They were crushed. Immediately after the occupation of Greece by the Nazis, the Fascists and their Balkan satellites, the Greeks organized, among the first, a resistance movement and for this they were punished more cruelly, perhaps, than any other of our allies on the part of the Nazis and the Fascists.

One might imagine that the Russians would feel a debt of gratitude to the Greeks, who made possible the successful resistance at Stalingrad. But Russian communism knows no such sentiments. Kremlin took advantage of the prostrate conditions of the nation to organize an internal conflagration and an external attack upon the unarmed and half-starved rural populations of Greece. This was the most acid test of the devotion of the Greeks to freedom and our own way of life, and they met it with undaunted courage until our own country gave them the means to do what no other larger or small country in Europe has yet achieved, to purge itself of the Communist pestilence.

Since then Greece has become so well known to official America that it is unnecessary for me to dwell upon the utmost suffering, the homelessness, of 800,000 people, the destruction of means of communication, the destruction of the farms and of the small industries of the country.

It is a wonder that since 1945 the Greek people have retained their strong faith in the ultimate vindication of their sacrifices for freedom and the ideal of democracy. To this optimism, the readiness of America to help has proved a great contribution.

The fact that in 1951 the Congress of the United States approved the entry into our country of seven and a half thousand of these homeless, destitute but heroic Greeks has given them faith that their sacrifices are well appreciated by the people of the United States. However, seven and a half thousand Greeks would not be a relief of the unemployed and suffering population of their country. It has been reported that from countries which either battled the ideal of democracy or readily yielded to the charms of fascism, the Congress of the United States would admit very large numbers, although the quotas of these countries are indeed considerable.

I would appeal in behalf of the expectant people of Greece that the allotments which are being considered for 2 countries of Europe which were on the other side of the fence in the battle for democracy, be reduced by at least 5,000 each, in order that the minimum for the Greeks may be 30,000.

This gesture on the part of the Congress of the United States will come as a recognition of the continued heroic effort of Greece to guard, together with its ally, Turkey, the gateway to the Near East against the hordes of Communists. Also, the Greeks in the United States who have viewed with uneasiness the utter reduction of the Greek quota, will be compensated somewhat by the admission of 30,000 of their close relatives from whom these Greek-Americans have homes, jobs, and the means of educating the orphaned sons and daughters of heroic Greek peasants who gladly fell in order that democracy may survive.

I am not by any means advocating that we should remember the grave errors of those of our present allies who failed to stand by democracy in its hour of peril. By all means, our country should relieve those countries also; but a gesture of recognition of the national bravery of the Greeks beyond the call of duty in defense of democracy is in order. The Greek nation is called upon even now to bear the cross of democracy and for many years we shall look to the Greeks to defend again the sector to which they have been assigned, and I am sure that the Greeks will give a good account of themselves.

May I also respectfully suggest that a certain moderate number of the admissible total be allotted for the entry of adopted children up to 18 years of age? Many orphans, wandering in the allied countries of Europe without homes, without means of subsistence, have been adopted by good people in the United States, most of them childless and anxious to educate and make the lot of these hopeless children a happy one.

A few thousands of such foster parents are in despair. They wonder if they will ever even meet their adopted children, orphans of the great storms that have washed away their parents and their homes. These young people, without roots in Europe, will become well anchored in the American way of life and will, in case of an international crisis, give their lives to save the land of their refuge, the great friend of innocent suffers everywhere.

(Whereupon, at 4:50 p. m., the subcommittee was recessed until 10 a. m., May 28, 1953.)

EMERGENCY MIGRATION OF ESCAPEES, EXPELLEES, AND REFUGEES

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a. m., in the Old Supreme Court room, the Capitol, Senator Arthur V. Watkins presiding.

Present: Senators Watkins and Welker.

Also present: Richard Arens, staff director; Drury Blair, staff member; and O. K. Earl, staff member.

Senator WELKER (presiding). The first witness this morning is George Washington Williams. Will you give your name, residence, and occupation?

STATEMENT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON WILLIAMS, BALTIMORE, MD., ON BEHALF OF THE GENERAL SOCIETY OF THE WAR OF 1812 AND MARYLAND SOCIETY OF THE WAR OF 1812

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am a member of the Maryland bar, and I live at 231 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Md. I represent the General Society of the War of 1812.

Senator WELKER. You may be seated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I stand, please?

Senator WELKER. You look like you are arguing with me that way. We will be glad to have you stand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

I represent the General Society of the War of 1812 and also the Maryland Society of the War of 1812. Of the former, I am the president and vice president, and the past president of the latter. Of course, it is with some diffidence that we appear in opposition to any movement which bears this label, with respect to what it might be to humanity. I think we do not lack human impulses any more than anybody else. But to me, the human element involves two elements of consideration; one is the necessities of America, and the other is the necessity of the people abroad. In our humble opinion, and in my humble opinion, the humanitarian—

Senator WELKER. Mr. Williams, may I present to you Senator Watkins, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed. Senator Welker has a committee meeting that he was attending but he came over here to start this hearing. We appreciate that. He has to leave now.

Go right ahead.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have already made some remarks identifying myself, sir.

Senator WATKINS. That is all right. Go ahead with what you want to tell us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I was saying, I think the scales weigh in favor of the American interests in connection with the element of humanity. The thing that I have in mind, and we have in mind, as much as anything else, if not more, perhaps, than anything else, is the fact that when we got into this second European debacle, we had tremendous unemployment here. Of course, a lot of those folks came over here to make a better place in the world for themselves, which, of course, includes employment. In that connection, I would like to read just a line from the *Miracle of America*, by Andre Maurois, a French author, who has written several penetrating books on America. He said at the beginning, I think, of a chapter at page 43:

The Europeans who had sought refuge in the new continent thought they had escaped the endemic feuds of Europe.

Then he later momentarily said that they seemed to have followed them over here. I say that we ought to consider our own capacities for handling the world problems. We simply cannot blind ourselves to our own interests by looking and concentrating upon the affairs of the world. If I may, I would like to use one sentence from a letter that a great English statesman wrote to Queen Victoria when they were trying to get England to do the same thing.

In 1869 he wrote this, and this is background:

Is England so uplifted in strength among other nations that she can, with prudence advertise herself as ready to undertake the general redress of wrongs? Would not the consequence of such professions and promises to be either the premature exhaustion of her means or a collapse in the day of performance?

We have taken on apparently the job of Atlas. All we hear from these gentlemen and ladies coming in here, who belong to what we sometimes refer to as hyphenated groups, is what some foreign country needs. You never hear a single one of them, or hardly hear a single one of them, talk about the needs of America. If they were as interested in getting out of here the millions of people who are in the country illegally as they are in getting in other people, then I think they would be serving America for a much better cause. I said to start with that when we got into this second European debacle, according to the Labor Department, we had 7 million people out of employment. According to the labor organizations, who are now sponsoring this bill, I understand, they had 10 million of people out of employment.

I would like to know how, and I would like to see them demonstrate how, they expect, after a shakedown comes, to absorb that corresponding population. I note David Lawrence in his paper said as early as 1945 that during this war period, the efficiency and production had increased 45 percent, which means the elimination of physical manpower unless some other means can be found to put those people to work.

Of course, the labor unions in days past were against all this mass immigration. That is, when they had a different type of leadership. In my opinion, the leadership today is not what it ought to be.

The labor unions now have gone into politics, and political considerations seem to push them as much as anything else. So I say that I think that the labor unions are doing their own people wrong, when they develop a condition here by reason of momentary pressures, which in the future is going to throw 8 or 10 million people out of employment, and there is no way to stop it.

I would like to see the day, I would like to see one of them when he appears to demonstrate how they propose to absorb the population when this full economy drops. You know, we have practically a dual economy here now. We naturally have the civil economy and paralleling with that we have practically a complete war economy. Unless we are going to keep that war economy up to practically the present costs and standards, there are bound to be people thrown out of employment.

If this civil economy is taken care of now, where are those people going to go? I say I hope this committee will bear in mind the fact that we went into this debacle as I say in Europe, that we had 8 or 10 million people out of employment, and you are going to have the same thing when this time is up, when we have a shakedown. They say we need manpower, as one of the gentlemen did. I should say because of the emergency that, all right, because of the emergency let somebody work an hour longer and maybe on Saturday, which I am perfectly willing to do, rather than see a lot of people brought in here who we cannot handle, and who we know perfectly well will be employed when the time comes for shedding off people.

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask you a question at that point. Maybe that is a division in your remarks. Have you ever thought of the other possibility of the United States being engaged in an all-out war? Have you thought of the possibility of the need for some additional manpower here?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir; I have thought about that. That will be taken care of in the regular emergency way by making people work longer than 5 days a week, which I am perfectly willing to do, and any other American ought to be willing to do.

Senator WATKINS. Do you think that we will be able to take care of all the increased production necessary for war if we have to, for instance, put 12 million men again under arms? Would not an addition of people who are properly screened be a help in that sort of a situation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If Your Honor please, I have in mind Gladstone's remark. I would rather take a chance on that than I would what is going to happen to us if we bring a gang more in here. Here is another thing I want to say in that respect: I understand there are 3 or 4 million people in here, aliens, 5 or 6 million aliens, half of whom are not in here legally. I have in here, which I want to put in at the proper juncture, a statement which I understand is an authoritative statement that in the last 3 years 600,000 have come into Canada, and they cannot be accounted for in Canada. This committee knows and everybody else knows where they are. I also have another article that I would like to put in at this juncture, as it seems to fit. I refer to the Daily Record, Baltimore, a legal paper which publishes other news, and under the heading "Aliens Reported Pouring in Illegally via Canada," it shows they claim about 600,000 have come through here which are here, and it shows the conduit, and one

of them is conducted by Luciano, from Sicily. I would like to put that into the record.

Senator WATKINS. May I see it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. The article offered by the witness will be made a part of the record. It is indicated under the heading "Aliens Reported Pouring Illegally in via Canada."

(The article referred to follows:)

[From the Daily Record, Baltimore, Md., Friday, October 24, 1952]

ALIENS REPORTED POURING ILLEGALLY IN VIA CANADA

ORGANIZED SMUGGLING RINGS SAID TO BE OPERATING THROUGH VERMONT

By United Press

St. Albans, Vt., October 23.—European aliens, including possible subversives, are pouring illegally into the United States from Canada at the rate of perhaps 33,000 yearly with the aid of organized smuggling rings, it has been reported.

Immigration officials are virtually powerless, because of lack of funds and manpower, to stem the parade of unauthorized immigrants—many from Iron Curtain nations—through a 30-mile funnel with the help of money-hungry Vermont farmers who collect from \$50 to \$300 a head.

LOOSE LAWS

The illegal alien traffic is made possible by loose Canadian immigration laws which set no quotas for entry of foreign nationals. A recent Canadian Government survey failed to locate half of 600,000 Europeans who have been brought to Canada since 1947. Border officials believed most entered the United States.

Immigration authorities said they have strong evidence one of the smuggling rings is operated from Sicily by Lucky Luciano, onetime New York overlord of crime, who was deported in 1946.

Chester Woish, chief border patrol inspector at Rouses Point, N. Y., said Luciano is linked with the Mafia Society, which recruits hoodlums in Sicily for gangster organizations in principal United States cities.

A husky Italian youth recently was seized by border patrol agents while attempting to cross a Vermont farm that straddles the United States-Canadian border.

FEARED FOR HIS LIFE

Questioned by immigration officials, the youth tearfully said, "To talk is to cut my throat." He said he had come to Montreal from Sicily, but refused to disclose who had helped him.

There is other evidence of terror in this alien traffic. The barn of one Vermont farmer, who was seen talking with a customs agent, burned to the ground next day. Another Vermonter was beaten severely one night after he reported persons crossing his land under cover of darkness. Still another was the target of a sniping gunman as he worked in his field near the border.

"We are positive there are organized rings which smuggle people into the United States from Canada," Woish said. He added most of the rings have headquarters in Montreal or New York.

"This border poses a dangerous security risk," he said. "It's a fine way for Russia to plant spies here."

Ernest E. Salisbury, director of immigration district 1, which stretches from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to the United States-Canadian border in Maine, said the number of aliens who cross the border yearly is uncertain, but that it is somewhere between 7,000 and 33,000.

"How can we count them if we can't even catch them?" he asked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore, we have in here innumerable immigrants that are not accounted for. I may say, I thought I heard Mr. Arens say yesterday that 225,000 came in instead of the 153,000 last year that were supposed to come in.

Mr. ARENS. I think the record ought to be clear. I think the accurate statement is this, that the quota immigrants under the law amount to approximately 154,000. In addition to the quota immigrants there are nonquota immigrants. The nonquota immigrants are supposed to come in. I did not want the words "supposed to come in" go unchallenged. That means that we have two broad categories of immigrants who are by definition persons coming for permanent residence. Last year we had approximately 265,000 immigrants admitted of whom, however, some were displaced persons who will be charged to future quotas. But the point I was making in the colloquy with the gentlemen yesterday is that there is no numerical ceiling on the number of immigrants as such under the immigration law. There is a numerical ceiling only on the number of quota immigrants.

I hope I make myself clear on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate that, sir. Therefore, there is a big loophole. Another item appearing in the same paper is headed "Puerto Ricans Arriving Here by Thousands." I am conscious of the fact that by act of Congress the Puerto Ricans are citizens, but those people, as far as I can understand, and I have been there a number of times myself, are practically as foreign as any other peoples coming in here so far as their capacity for participating in Government is concerned.

Senator WATKINS. They seem to have plenty of effect in the elections.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I am saying. It won't be long before they will control the elections and they are not fit to vote in this country at this time, in my humble opinion. When I say anything about the foreign peoples, I hope it will be understood I am not saying anything from a moral standpoint at all. I would probably be doing exactly what they are doing if I was a part of that group. But not being a part of it is not any reason why what I refer to as old-line Americans should sit by and see the principles of our Government converted into paternalism and what has been referred to as statism and a welfare state. I think we are at the crossroads in this country today.

In that respect, and I think that those people are not fit to vote, they are going to vote according to their local and immediate personal necessities. I hope to give reference to a couple of articles appearing in the Congressional Record, which you may or may not have seen, dealing with New York City, and which in my opinion is a congeries of foreign citizens and not an American city at all.

I do not say that derogatorily to the people, because I know they are doing what I would do, concentrating in their own areas when not living abroad. It says here approximately 70,000 Puerto Ricans will have immigrated to the United States by the end of the year, according to an official source. They are having an overproduction of people just like in Italy. The Premier of Italy had the unmitigated nerve and gall to say that he had to export 200,000 Italians a year. That means somebody has to take them whether they need them or not so far as he is concerned. I would like to say that I do not think those people have a right to come into a country that does not need them as our people did originally. Our people came to a wild country, and they hewed out this great Nation. I say of those

people, 80 million, as you say here, the surplus population in Europe, let them go to a country like Africa, where you have all kinds of resources and the same means as we did here. I think they ought to be shunted over there.

There is quite an article on the resources and area of Africa which can take on these people. Are they any better to do that than our own people were? I say they are not. I am not saying that in a harmful fashion. I say it is coming to a time when America should look after her own interest. I find it written that if any provide not for his own and especially for those in his own house, he has denied the faith and is worse than an infidel. I say we are wrong in taking today's position. I notice repeatedly in the Congressional Record the representatives in Congress from these congested areas are constantly putting in articles and making demands that more people come in. I would like to, for future reference, for anybody that cares to look up some of these articles, refer to the one put in by Hon. Arthur W. Klein, May 26, page A3122, entitled "The Shame in Housing." He goes on to show the wretched and miserable condition existing in New York City, in connection with housing, and yet he wants to bring in more, knowing perfectly well irrespective of where they land first, they will go into those centers. I have not heard of a single farmer yet that came over here that stayed on a farm. There are probably some, but the ones I have personal knowledge of left and went back to the cities, where they all will.

I would like to refer to one Senator Kennedy put in the other day, on May 25, page 5636, entitled "The Economic Problems of New England, a Program for Congressional Action."

Here is another one, put in by Hon. Thomas J. Lane of April 23, page A2256, entitled "The Textile Industry." They are howling about the condition in New England. And in the article which has been a studied article on the subject of New England, it says at page A2256, other pending possible legislation. Social security, some form of insurance for farm loans and so on. Then he says Massachusetts and Rhode Island have had serious spells of unemployment for many years. In fact, Rhode Island has had the highest unemployment of any State in the Union over 10 years.

That area is where the large population of foreign people are. Then he had the unmitigated gall to write two paragraphs down that the restricted immigration has deprived New England of about 2 million population and therefore we should liberalize the laws.

If anyone with an ounce of sense can reconcile those two statements, I would like to see him do it. We find all the pressures in those cities which are dominated by the recent immigrants, constantly pushing the Federal Government into a rank paternalism. They are pushing for housing and all sorts of things. That is why Congress is so busy, because they entered into the State fields and private fields, and it absorbs their time on those things which ought to be absorbed in international affairs, in my humble opinion.

So you find the same in Detroit. Here is an article showing that they had 86,000 out of employment there a short time ago. So when they talk about lack of manpower, we do not lack manpower, as far as I can see it. If I may say parenthetically, I do not expect any general war. It is not the policy of Russia to get into a general war. Lenin's policy

was to take this country at an economic debacle and take over. I can read you from the 10 volumes of his selected works and show you that is his avowed policy and the policy they have been working on all the time. They do not intend to get into a war with us if there is a way to avoid it, because they expect to get us by these needling processes like Korea, and the next will be Indochina.

By those needling processes, maybe the oilfields, by those they expect to make us spend ourselves broke. Today we have a sum that is so colossal on us that you can't comprehend it—something like \$270 billion. On top of that, the paternalistic thing like guaranteeing houses on GI homes. Those pressures are brought upon us by reason of the paternalistic development in this country which ought not to exist, in my opinion.

These folks coming here have their eyes in my opinion turned toward the East more than they do here. As I say, when I say that, I do not charge them with any moral turpitude or lack of patriotism. It is natural when they come here to have an interest in their fatherlands and whatnot. In my opinion, they have had a lot to do with turning elections. I could refer you to several items, for instance, where the development is along the lines of looking after their own people and forgetting the momentary interest in America. I have in my hand a book written by Ambassador Lane, headed *I Saw Poland Betrayed*. In that book, you will find the head of the Polish-American Congress, Mr. Rozmarek, saying that their votes in 1944 turned on Roosevelt's promise as to what they would do for Poland. I refer to pages 59, 60, and 61. It says in one place there Mr. Rozmarek's endorsement of the present position was made known through the Polish language papers to Polish-American groups throughout the country who largely supported the Democratic ticket on that assurance. He had written, "Because I am convinced of his sincerity I shall vote for him in November for President of the United States."

There is a man out of his own mouth who said he has his vote and his people's vote predicated on the theory that he was going to do something for Poland. He did not consider the American interest in that whatsoever.

I picked up the Congressional Record the other day and I find Mr. Moulter putting in an article in which he said he is in favor of the world Jewish unity. And they are developing that habit. How can people doing that have an eye to America? As I say, I do not make any hypercritical comment on that, I just mention it as the concrete fact.

So I say that we come fast to the point in America where we have to take stock of our own interest. I consider the long-term interest the real interest to consider. It looks like expediency has become king in this country, and I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States should stop and take stock. I do not believe, as far as my humble opinion is concerned, that the suggestion made by the chairman ought to be a dominating one.

Senator WATKINS. I merely asked you if you had taken that into consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I did. And I frankly say I don't believe we are going to have any such thing as that. It is not the policy.

Senator WATKINS. I hope you are right. I hope we do not have a war.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All you have to do, all Mr. Roosevelt had to do when he was running the war, was to read the literature of Lenin and the basic literature on which the Soviet Union was operating and he would have found a great many things that would have saved us a lot of trouble at the present time. He made the cardinal blunder, of course, of saying that Russia was on our side. Russia has never been on our side. It might have been on the same side by advantageous circumstances, but he treated her as though she were on our side, which as a tragic and cardinal blunder, if Your Honor please.

Senator WATKINS. You have already had 25 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank you for the time taken. If I happen to speak with a little vigor, it does not mean there is asperity in my voice. I am speaking for America, and I hope nobody will think I am berating foreign people. I am merely saying I think we have enough of those folks here who are turning them in a direction that they ought not to go.

I thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you for your contribution.

Mrs. William D. Leetch? State for the record your name, address, and if you have an occupation or profession or represent anybody officially.

STATEMENT OF MADELINE DINGLEY LEETCH, NATIONAL DEFENSE AND LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN AND THE NATIONAL SOCIETY WOMEN DESCENDANTS OF THE ANCIENT AND HONORABLE ARTILLERY COMPANY

Mrs. LEETCH. Good morning. I am Madeline Leetch. I am the national defense and legislative chairman for the National Society of New England Women. Another organization is named there, too. I am a housewife. I am a resident of the District of Columbia, with a voting residence in the State of Michigan.

I have brought you the resolutions of the National Society of New England Women and the National Society of the Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company who have recently held national conventions.

I ask that these be incorporated in the record, Senator.

Senator WATKINS. May I see them?

Mrs. LEETCH. Yes, indeed. My remarks are my own.

Senator WATKINS. The resolutions will be received in the record. (The resolutions referred to follow:)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 26TH ANNUAL RENDEZVOUS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY WOMEN DESCENDANTS OF THE ANCIENT AND HONORABLE ARTILLERY COMPANY, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 14, 1953

Resolved. That the National Society Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company in 26th annual rendezvous support the McCarran-Walter immigration law against repeal or crippling amendments urged by pressure groups for ulterior purposes.

The society also commended Senator McCarran.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 40TH CONGRESS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN, THE WENTWORTH-BY-THE-SEA, PORTSMOUTH, N. H., MAY 19, 20, 21, 1953

SUPPORT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Whereas bills have been introduced in the House and Senate for the admission of from 328,000 to 400,000 special visa or nonquota immigrants or refugees, and

Whereas 4 years' study produced the present law which was passed over the President's veto and became effective December 24, 1952,

Resolved That the 40th Congress of the National Society of New England Women support this Immigration and Nationality Act together with its national origins principle and quota system and careful screening process and oppose crippling amendments or the admittance of aliens outside of the provisions of this act.

The group also commended Senator McCarran.

Mrs. LEETCH. These societies have always believed that the United States should place the safety and welfare of their fellow citizens above the interests of foreign nations and alien people. It is common-sense to protect the American economy, independence of foreign ideologies, insure employment, adequate housing and educational opportunities for Americans first, as a logical measure for the survival of this Republic.

Knowing Senators Watkins and Dirksen we believe they think so, too. They are sterling Americans. We were shocked that somehow political expediency has apparently forced this move upon them. We do not think that receiving a letter from the President "makes it clear" to Senator Watkins that "it is in our interests" that we receive 240,000 or any other number of special visa, meaning nonquota, immigrants. Taking note of the neat way certain dissenting Senators formerly sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 1 are now saying they only did so to get the subject matter discussed, we commend this "out" for the use of pro-American and proconstitutional Senators in this instance.

Gentlemen, citizens who voted for a change are sick and tired of the executive branch of the Government directing what the legislative branch shall do. It is abject abdication of your authority under the Constitution to legislate what the people want. Do you think that the people of Utah or Illinois want this legislation when it is brought home to them? You have the legislative power, a power the President does not have, but has usurped for 20 years. It is the way dictators come to power. This is a constitutional question. You should be jealous of your superior power in the field of legislation. You are elected for 6 years, the President for only 4. We repose our greatest faith in the legislative branch of the Government. Why do you acquiesce to this pushing around at the expense of the people of your States and of the country?

For the American people who voted a change, it is a case of heads you win and tails I lose. Here we have the best men on our team carrying the ball for Senators Lehman and Humphrey. But the Republicans, gentlemen, are going to be the losers, and with their defeat will go the hopes of pro-Americans of both political parties and probably the last bulwark against Fabian socialism also.

Senators know that the arguments contained in the President's letter were also advanced by sponsors of similar type legislation in the last administration. Humanitarian arguments should no longer prevail when it is apparent that the security and economic well-being of the United States is at stake. When you know that depression is just around the corner how do you dare to bring in extra mouths to feed?

For many years sentimental ideas have prevailed. An endless horde of foreigners streamed into our country while our gates stood virtually open, until the first quota law was passed by the 67th Congress. We have led off and shown our good will for years. There is nothing new and benevolent in that suggestion. What is the harvest?

In return for our humanitarianism we learn from the Attorney General of the United States, as quoted by Senator McCarran January 6, 1950, in his *Displaced Persons, Facts Versus Fiction*:

Let it be remembered that the Attorney General of the United States recently testified that an analysis of 4,984 of the more militant members of the Communist Party in the United States showed that 91.4 percent of the total were of foreign stock.

The most casual reader of the daily papers is struck with the fact that persons of foreign names, from foreign lands and/or foreign parents are in the majority of unfriendly witnesses, loyalty suspects or convicted traitors. Many change their names the more readily to infiltrate. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Soviet Espionage, 1951, page 3, states:

Of the 4 betrayers of atomic secrets only 1 is American born; only he is an American citizen.

The Immigration and Naturalization System of the United States, pages 629-630, tells us that there is ample evidence that there is an alarmingly large number of aliens in the United States, in an illegal status. Some become public burdens on relief rolls.

Senator Watkins mentioned first that this is an "emergency and temporary program." Sounds familiar. We have had nothing but emergencies for 20 years. Hitler got to power on emergencies by building up the power of the executive always at the expense of the legislative. Where is original thought, where is your honest judicial function? The trouble is that emergencies have saddled us with programs the effects of which are permanent and cannot be undone. This executive proposal is in that category.

The "security of the free world" expression is right out of the foreign policy book of the Truman administration. I tell you, at this critical time we are interested in the security of the United States of America, period. The so-called free world is letting us down. Korea was a test of the application of the principles of collective security. It is a failure on the record. If Britain and France are examples of free world on whom we count for security, they are playing "footsie" with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and have been all along, through their implementation of mutual assistance and nonaggression pacts with the U. S. S. R. Surely we won't risk United States security by relieving the free world of their dangers of population pressures by taking them on ourselves. Have we got to give ourselves the disease to free them of it?

S. 1917 attempts to provide protection against the displacement of an American from employment or housing by immigrants. How can words written into legislation do this? It is an impossible objective. Why should this Government add to its present problems of unemployment, housing, and education, not to mention social-security benefits, by making adequate plans for immigrants and their families before departure from Europe? We can't make adequate plans for our own. What are adequate plans anyway, and what do they cost

United States taxpayers now overburdened largely because of foreign relief spending? Are they going to live in tents, since they are not going to occupy houses?

The least appealing argument made by Senator Watkins on behalf of the Executive is that this emergency will do much to satisfy some of our domestic manpower needs. That one will really make the people of Utah and American fathers and mothers mad. If we would stop drafting American sons to fight bloody battles to preserve other people's real estate all over the world, we could fill our own manpower needs, couldn't we? We wouldn't need to import foreigners who should stay at home and protect their own interests, build up their own economy and fight for their own freedom and that of the free world—in order to work in United States factories and on United States farms.

Did you ever talk to Americans who have hired and sponsored such foreign domestic and farm help? They have had disillusioning experiences. Those immigrants don't stay put long. How can you prevent their moving on to greener pastures and cashier jobs? As a matter of fact, that is exactly what has happened in actual experience.

Why on earth should the United States be the scapegoat for Greek nationals who cannot be satisfactorily employed by the Greek economy? Or Dutch nationals so the Netherlands can maintain its traditional position in defense of freedom. What becomes of interest in the maintenance of a sound United States economy and traditional United States position in the defense of freedom? The least alluring prospect is to take 110,000 so-called German expellees—whatever they are. What does that mean? Will the people of Utah like that? These come from Iron Curtain Communist-Socialist countries imbued through centuries with an ideology of dependence upon some form of autocracy or imperialism, diametrically opposed to our own concept of government.

If there are 30 million refugees as the Senator states, 240,000 will be a drop in the bucket. The problem cannot be solved by the United States taking this chance on 240,000 now. That experience indicates that very soon another plea will be made to take an additional number.

Isn't it possible to settle whole colonies of these people in the less industrialized countries if necessary to move them out of their own lands where there is the kind of work for them to do to which they are accustomed? How about strategic areas in the Mediterranean or South America? Arm them and let them fight for their own freedom and that of the free world. If they are worth their salt they should be glad of the opportunity. Do they clamor to come here because they think it is easy living and the streets are paved with gold?

United States taxpayers have financed a 4-year study of this whole problem. A liberal, generous, unbiased, nondiscriminatory law has just gone into effect as of December 24, 1952. Additional study is unwarranted at this time.

S. 1917 would create another job for a so-called Emergency Migration Coordinator at \$17,500 a year, and he is authorized to employ some helpers. Of course he would find that necessary. It is further proposed to make loans of money we haven't got, since we have a huge national debt and an unbalanced budget, to persons and organizations for the purposes of this act.

We are opposed to creating more bureaucrats and bureaus to spend our money. This is an evil the Republicans promised to cure, along with reduced expenses so we could cut taxes. Instead we find them perpetuating the evil.

We believe that self-preservation demands the United States act now in the national interest. We need a law that will allow us at least a minimum of self-defense and is mindful of United States security. The McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act is a sound attempt in this direction. To change it, by-pass it, or weaken it would be disastrous.

We therefore oppose the consideration of S. 1917 at this time.

Senator WATKINS. We thank you for your coming here and letting us know your views about the bill.

Mrs. LEETCH. Senator, I would like to comment on this resettlement in other areas of the world. I know I followed quite a good deal of what has been said and done in psychological warfare. I know there is a grave and serious and well-taken concern for White Russians, say in Shanghai, in the western section of Germany, who are anxious to work somewhere. The psychological men, warfare men, have suggested to the proper departments of our Government that those people be moved so that their lives will not be forfeit should the Reds move in, and put in these strategic areas, and armed by the United States so that they may fight, because they will fight to the death. Their lives are forfeit, they will not surrender. There is a whole colony of those presently in French Morocco. I know. That has been done. Not by this Government, however, but it has been. So it is a possibility that seems to me worthy of your earnest consideration, to make use of those people in less industrialized countries, and by the United States where they will defend themselves and the free world.

Senator WATKINS. May I assure you from the highest authority that an effort is now being made to do the very thing you are talking about in the unsettled portions of the world.

Mrs. LEETCH. Wonderful. I am for that. I think that is the thing to do.

Senator WATKINS. And these would set a little example. We know it would not be anything more than a dent in the problem, but it would be a wonderful stimulus to help get that going. That is why this bill.

Mrs. LEETCH. Not by this bill. I take exception to that. We do not want them here. That is not going to do any good.

Senator WATKINS. Some of us want them here. I certainly am willing to do my part to help win the war.

Mrs. LEETCH. Are you in favor of this bill?

Senator WATKINS. Certainly. I introduced the bill.

Mrs. LEETCH. Certainly, but a lot of men said they sponsored the resolution and said they only did it to get it discussed.

Senator WATKINS. I do not know of any man on this bill that is not for the bill.

Mrs. LEETCH. I am glad to know that.

Senator WATKINS. And many of them are supporters of the McCarran Act.

Mrs. LEETCH. May I say I am extremely disappointed to have the best men on our team carrying the ball for left-wing Democrats.

Senator WATKINS. There is a difference of opinion. It is possible we could be right.

Mrs. LEETCH. If this administration is right, the last one was right, too, which you opposed at that time, Senator.

Senator WATKINS. We don't believe that everything the last administration did was wrong. Do you?

Mrs. LEETCH. You were for the McCarran-Walter Act, and you were against the attempts of Mr. Humphrey and Mr. Lehman.

Senator WATKINS. I certainly was against that, and I still am. And I still am in favor of the McCarran Act as our permanent immigration policy. I do not care to argue the matter with you. You are entitled to your day. We appreciate your courtesy in letting us know your views. We know there are a lot of people who feel exactly as you do about this matter, and they have a right to be heard here, and we want you to be heard.

Mrs. LEETCH. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Senator WATKINS. We are used to being flayed, so we do not object to it. We would not feel at home if somebody was not giving us a going over.

Congressman Javits?

Representative JAVITS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. JACOB K. JAVITS, A UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Senator WATKINS. We are glad to have you come over, Mr. Congressman.

Representative JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am Jacob K. Javits, a Member of the House of Representatives from the 21st Congressional District of New York.

Mr. Chairman, I have no prepared statement, but I would like to make a statement, if I may, which will be quite brief. I joined with Senators Ives, Ferguson, and Hendrickson in sponsoring a bill which preceded the bill which I am very glad to see the Senator has introduced, and I am here to testify in support of the administration position on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, one of the very important campaign statements made by General Eisenhower, at least in my area of the country, which is the industrial East, related to immigration. I believe that we should bear in mind also the fundamental statement on immigration which the President made in his state of the Union message in which he said:

It is the manifest right of our Government to limit the number of immigrants our Nation can absorb. It is also the manifest right of our Government to set reasonable requirements on the character and the numbers of the people who come to share our land and our freedom. It is well for us, however, to remind ourselves occasionally of an equally manifest fact. We are one and all immigrants or the sons of and daughters of immigrants.

Mr. Chairman, I sit on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. We have a considerable amount of experience with the problems in the so-called cold war.

In my own experience as a member of that committee I feel that these escapees from behind the Iron Curtain are as vital a blow as can be struck against the Communists and their satellites. They are tremendously useful to us in terms of world opinion. They are tremen-

dously useful to us strategically as well. I think there is pretty general agreement in our country that it is in the interest of the free world that these escapees should continue, really showing up the Communists in all their claims of the perfect world on the grassroots level. Their people are anxious to get into the free world. That is, people who have any kind of human decency and human instinct. While practically no one, except a few fanatics, wants to get into the Communist world.

I have been through a good many of the refugee camps in West Berlin. In 1947 I was a member of a special group from the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee that looked into the whole displaced persons situation. I think our report had a fair amount to do with the passage of the displaced persons law. In 1951 I went through the refugee camp in West Berlin. Hence I think I know a little bit about the ideas and psychology of people who are escaping from behind the Iron Curtain. One of the very great inducements in addition to the thirst for freedom, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the free world offers a real haven, a real alternative. Anyone who saw the face of the Russian flyer the other day before a House committee, who at least begins to have the prospect of being granted asylum here, can realize the importance to these escapees of the fact that they can have a haven and that even the doors of the United States may be open to them.

Mr. Chairman, it is very important, therefore, if we are to get the benefits, the full advantage, of these escapes from behind the Iron Curtain, that the possibility of resettlement by immigration in a place of the escapee's choice is given to him. We know from experience with the displaced-persons law that there will be no major amount of resettlement of these escapees in the world unless the United States takes its fair share. This is, I think, elementary. We found it in the displaced-persons-law experience. The administration proposes that the United States, at least in principle, take its fair share of these escapees. In addition, the administration proposes to deal with one of Europe's most vexing problems, the problem of surplus workers, which is now under the care of an international organization called the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Migration of Europeans (PICME), which the chairman is well acquainted with.

Again, this effort to deal with one of Europe's major problems will not get off the ground or get anywhere by money contributions alone, but only if we show willingness to take our fair share of the people who need an opportunity for resettlement.

Hence, both in respect to escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, for strategic reasons, and for very important reasons in our winning the cold war with the Soviet bloc, and second, in helping Europe deal with the very vexing problem of surplus workers, neither of these problems will get to a real and constructive solution unless the United States is willing to take its fair share of those who need to be resettled.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support the objective of this bill before this subcommittee, subject to a review of the particular quota allocations on a case-by-case basis. I have one suggestion in respect to this bill which I would like to submit, and that is that instead of allocating, as the bill does, all the visas, the whole 240,000, in a specific way with a rather modest number of 15,000 allocated to the escapees—

Senator WATKINS. May I suggest that I think probably the bill allows 15,000 for NATO countries.

Representative JAVITS. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. That is just a general catchall proposition. But escapees and expellees are in the group of 110,000, as I understand the bill.

Representative JAVITS. I see, the escapees also come into that group, and that is the intention of the committee. I think that is fine but I feel the adequacy of the particular allocations should be reviewed under the facts. I was going to make this suggestion, that it might be possible to provide also as was provided under the displaced persons law, for visas to those who, for some lawful reason or other, find themselves in the United States. Some of these people who are escapees and expellees and would otherwise come under the provisions of this act, have, for some reason, medical treatment, student visas, or so for some other reason, now found themselves in the United States. There are quite a few private bills pending for such people. It might be advisable for the committee to determine that the same provision ought to be made here as was made in the displaced persons law, to permit some issuance of visas to people who qualify under this law but who find themselves physically within the United States for some legal and proper reason.

Senator WATKINS. If they got here legally I think that suggestion might be considered. But if they got here illegally, I do not believe so.

Representative JAVITS. I believe the DP law covered that subject, and I believe it would deserve study by the subcommittee as a possible amendment to this bill. The other thing that occurred to me, is the possibility, in view of the contingencies which we may encounter, and to take care of such a problem as Dr. Judd mentioned yesterday, Chinese intellectuals who find themselves in an area of Asia, it might be advisable for the committee to set up some unit figure, it does not have to be too great, say 10,000 visas or perhaps a smaller number, which could be utilized in the interest of the United States, with authority in the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, and with the requirement of a report to the appropriate congressional committee, to meet these contingencies which are constantly coming up in our world.

Mr. ARENS. How about the Palestinian and Arabian situation. I think Dr. Judd also spoke about them. Do you go along on some kind of an arrangement to be made there?

Representative JAVITS. It is my firm theory with respect to the Palestine Arabs, that their resettlement is a major problem facing the Near East. I think in view of the great expanses of land which are available in the Near East, I think the policy dictated is for work efforts coupled with resettlement efforts in that area of the world. However, if there is to be any international cognizance of resettlement outside the Near East, then certainly again, I think the same principle obtains. We could not hope to have international cognizance, as the thing is organized today, of an international refugee problem, unless the United States was willing to make some contribution.

Mr. ARENS. Of course the United States has contributed already about \$250 million.

Representative JAVITS. I was saying not only in money, because we found that in the displaced persons and I think we are finding it in this PICME organization in Europe, and again with respect to these

escapees. We would need to make some contribution outside of financial contributions.

Senator WATKINS. Do you think the Arabs want to come to this country?

Representative JAVITS. I have not the remotest notion, sir. I certainly did not have the impression that they did.

Senator WATKINS. Our information is that there is not any pressure whatever coming from the Arabs.

Representative JAVITS. I should not think so, sir. But I was answering Mr. Arens question as sincerely as I felt he asked it, following the general principle of refugee resettlement by international action outside their own area. You have to have an international plan for resettling the Palestine Arabs in the Arab countries, which I favor. I have always supported the appropriations we made for this purpose. I have been over there and I think I have done my utmost to see that the problem gets settled in the most just way.

Senator WATKINS. May I say to you that I introduced a bill here about a month or 6 weeks ago, S. 1766, which had for its purpose the coordination of all of our efforts with respect to refugees. It provided for a Commissioner of Refugees and would put in that one office our whole effort under his direction. Instead of having some 10 agencies that now represent us, and which we are financing in whole or in part, we would have it reduced to 1, at least as far as we are officially concerned. Then we could probably get a unified policy and maybe go places. The way it is now, we have agencies competing with each other and refugees have even gotten to a point, I understand, where they wait for a higher bid from one agency as against another.

Under circumstances of that kind, it seems to me that it would be a constructive step to whatever we are going to do, to do it intelligently and under one hand so we would not be working at cross purposes and have a lot of duplication and waste. There is no doubt in my mind but we have had a lot of waste in the program. It is inevitable unless it is well managed and well directed.

Representative JAVITS. I shall certainly get a copy of that bill and study it with the greatest care. I feel in this whole area of escapees and refugees that we are dealing with one of the world's very great problems, and in particular areas with a very nettling problem, as in this Near East situation. I do believe that in the Near East, which is a little off the subject of this bill, the major effort of the free world needs to be to bring about resettlement in areas in the Near East which are hungry for people and hungry for water. With the rather extensive funds available to the United Nations Commission charged with that responsibility, the people right there, who are indigenous and brothers of the other Arabs in the Arabian countries, it is terribly frustrating and very discouraging that we have been able to make so little progress because of the incendiary political situation there.

Mr. ARENS. A subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I understand, is making a study of that situation now.

Representative JAVITS. I understand that. I understand Senator Gillette is sitting with respect to it. I shall certainly give all aid that I can to a just settlement of that problem.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. The Right Reverend Edward E. Swanstrom, representing War Relief Services. For the purpose of the record, will you state your name, your address, and give your official position?

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MSGR. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF WAR RELIEF SERVICES, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, ACCOMPANIED BY REV. ALOYSIUS, J. WYCISLO, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, AND MAGARE M. LITCKE, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Monsignor SWANSTROM. I am Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of the War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have someone with you?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Yes, sir. This is Father Aloysius Wycislo, the assistant executive director of War Relief Services, NCWC, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City; and Magare Littke, administrative assistant to War Relief Services NCWC, also 350 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Mr. Chairman and counsel, I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to appear before you since I feel that the problem you are discussing is one of the most vital of our times. Your counterpart committee in the House of Representatives has already been given ample and convincing testimony at the hearings it has conducted on the same matter last fall in reference to the Celler bill and again within the past week or so in considering a committee print similar to your own bill. I am certain that the evidence that is being brought before you will be equally telling.

Two Presidents of different political persuasion have asked for legislation to tackle this problem, and leading members of the Cabinet and various departments of Government under both administrations have testified fully to the need for such legislation. The studies made by committees of both Houses who have gone abroad are equally persuasive. All of these have pointed out very convincingly, to my mind, not only the value of such legislation to those who will benefit by it, but its value to our own United States, both in terms of the enlightened self-interest as it relates to our foreign policy and in terms of the agricultural and skilled labor which it can provide and which we badly need.

Leading world statesmen from other countries in the free world, as you, yourself, pointed out in introduction of the bill, have also spoken of the tremendous value it would have in the critical situation the whole world is facing. One cannot simply write off by a wave of the hand or a few ill-considered words the value and importance of the testimony of such significant witnesses.

I know your committee will weigh the wealth of that testimony very carefully. Since I have been working amongst the groups to which it relates for the past 10 years, I can testify wholeheartedly to the accuracy and validity of the facts that have been already offered. I have probably visited and talked with more refugees, escapees, and expellees than almost any American with few exceptions. Every year for the past 5 years I have been visiting the camps and areas in which they are forced to live. I have first-hand knowledge of conditions in Germany, Italy, Trieste, and the Netherlands. Of Greece, I can speak from reports that we receive from our field representatives. Therefore, I can say without fear of contradiction that Senator Watkins' bill puts its finger on some of the sorest spots in a very troubled world.

You have to live in southern Italy, for example, for a couple of weeks and go out day after day into different towns and villages to fully appreciate what American aid really means as far as the salvation of that country from the Communist threat is concerned. The thing that I am trying to point out rather than just to repeat facts that everyone else will give you is the conviction that what we are dealing here with is an issue vital to the peace and security of the whole free world. The United States, as a Nation, has assumed a world leadership that has come, not of its volition but by the force of circumstances and the blessing of Almighty God. It is looked upon throughout the free world as the strongest bulwark against communism. Our Government today represents a way of life for which men in other countries who still have a semblance of freedom are striving with might and main to achieve.

Thank God we still have a confidence in our Government and in our way of life. We have no fear of depression, no fear about our own security and therefore we do not have to fear that by admitting a few hundred thousand more people to the United States at this time we are going to destroy the things that we hold dear. When we bring people into the United States on the basis of home and job assurances, we are not displacing any American nor will we displace him from his home or job. Our people came to realize that under our experiences with the displaced persons program. It is true that a few of the displaced persons shifted from their original locations, but by and large they have settled down pretty well and have been assimilated into our economy, and scarcely anyone realizes that they are now here.

America has always been known as a Nation with a generous heart. In a sense its name is synonymous with charity, and that probably as much as anything else has helped to make America great. Our country had its origin in a struggle for liberty. Once established as an independent Republic, it became the refuge of those who preferred freedom in America to the conditions prevailing in their native lands. Differing widely in culture, belief, and capacity for self-government, they had as their common characteristic the desire for liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Within a century those diverse elements had been formed together in a Nation powerful, prosperous, and contented. As they advanced in fortune, they broadened in generosity; and today, as after the last World War, those early refugees are restoring the breath of life to the peoples of Europe. In this trying period in the world's history, if we were to depart from that position we would not be able to hold up our head as a Nation.

I wish I could clearly express in words the psychological effect that the passage of a bill like the Watkins bill would have in countries like Germany, Italy, and Greece.

Right now Italy is coming up to a national election, and the Communists are using every device in their power to propagandize the Italian people into their way of voting. An announcement in Italy that the Congress of the United States had passed a bill to admit, among others, even such a limited number as 75,000 Italians would have a tremendous effect in offsetting such propaganda despite what some may think to the contrary. It would not mean that hundreds of thousands of Italians were being given an opportunity to get away from the poverty and unemployment and underemployment that is their lot at the present time, but it would mean an indication of hope to

all those who have to struggle under such conditions; not that they are coming to the United States, but that someone is interested in their welfare, and they may have a chance to go somewhere else. The Italians know, as everyone else knows, that this further expression of leadership on the part of the United States would be an example to other countries like Canada, Australia, and the South American republics to step up their own efforts in this same direction.

It is for this I urge you very strongly to impress upon your full committee the need for an early introduction of this measure on the floor of the Senate and its ultimate passage.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very kindly for your statement. Do your companions have a statement to make in addition?

Reverend WYCISLO. No, sir.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. We are just going to file that one statement.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask a question?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Reverend Swanstrom, so that the record is clear, your advocacy here differs somewhat from the advocacy of the Church World Service Group on the classes to be embraced, does it not?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. It does; yes.

Mr. ARENS. The Church World Service, if I make a mistake please correct me, advocates confining the legislation exclusively to persons who would be within the refugee category, and you are advocating embracing not only the refugees, but also in addition certain persons in the nonrefugee category; is that correct?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Like so-called Italian nationals. I feel strongly about that because of the psychological effect that it will have in Italy.

There is another important point, too. You have a larger number of people to draw from. You could select people who would be best needed, most needed, in the United States, and you have an opportunity to do a much better resettlement job by including that many more people into the category.

Mr. ARENS. In the course of your visits to Italy or to refugee areas, did you have occasion to ascertain whether or not the Italian ethnics who were thrown back from the colonies are an identifiable group of 500,000?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. They are identifiable because in all those little towns people know who were the ones that came back from the colonies. A few of them are living in camps, but the large majority are attempting to eke out a living in the various communities, I think they would be identifiable; yes.

Mr. ARENS. I assume, also, so that the record may be perfectly clear, that your advocacy goes not only with reference to the nationals of Italy, but also the nationals of Holland and of Greece?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Of Greece and the Netherlands; yes. For much the same reason, too.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very kindly for your statement.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. William Heimlich?

Will you state your name, address, your occupation or profession, and whether or not you represent any group?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. HEIMLICH, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HEIMLICH. My name is William F. Heimlich; I live in Washington, D. C. I am a businessman and represent no group. However, I was Chief of Intelligence in Berlin, designated by General Eisenhower in 1945, and associated with security groups until 1949. I returned from Europe on my last visit just 3 weeks ago.

During the course of the last 9 weeks I have visited most of the displaced persons' camps, refugee camps in western Berlin, Western Germany, a considerable number of them in Austria, Italy, and France.

Mr. ARENS. What was the occasion for your visit over there?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I was on a mission for the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate.

Senator WATKINS. Are you now employed by the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. HEIMLICH. No, sir. I have terminated my activities with the committee.

Senator WATKINS. When did you terminate those?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I was on a voluntary basis, not compensated.

I should like to point out only certain aspects of security matters dealing with so-called refugees and expellees. There are, as you know, sir, 11 agencies to which public funds are being given, who deal with the problems of refugees and expellees, and no 2 of these agencies have the same definition for what constitutes an expellee or a refugee.

Senator WATKINS. I understood we had 10, maybe we have discovered another 1 that we do not know about. Is that right, Mr. Arens?

Mr. ARENS. Well, in general, we speak of 10 agencies operating in Central Europe in the refugee field, or 10 types of agencies, including both governmental and intergovernmental agencies and the ministries and departments of the various Western European countries which, if taken in the aggregate, would exceed 10, but set up on the chart which we prepared after we got back, just for the Central European refugees, we speak of it as 10 different entities.

Mr. HEIMLICH. I think that is correct, sir. I had the additional 1 of public funds going to the West German Government for the purpose of taking care of refugees there. That is 2 marks, 6 pfennigs per day.

Mr. ARENS. In addition to that, so that the record is clear, there are various agencies operating, Government or intergovernmental agencies, both in Korea and with the Palestinian Arab refugees, which would be in addition to the 10 operating in Central Europe.

Mr. HEIMLICH. My observations, sir, have nothing to do with the humanitarian or moral aspects of the admission of refugees, but rather to point out the difficulties of taking proper security measures. As a matter of fact, as I understand the present resolution, if it were to be adopted we would have people like Max Fischner, who is now Minister of Justice in Eastern Communist Germany, or Anna Pauker, of Rumania, admissible.

Senator WATKINS. Do you mean that they could come in under this act?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, sir; because they were victims of oppression. Senator WATKINS. Of course, we know the main provisions of the McCarran Act apply in this case. This is well within the framework of that act if you take into consideration what is in the McCarran Act. They certainly could not get by the McCarran Act, could they?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Senator, I would assume my ex-colleagues would be more alert than that. I was pointing this out as an extreme case. It is impossible to obtain police records for those people who escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. The German police, I think, are doing as good a job as can possibly be done in screening people that come from the East for criminal tendencies.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Heimlich, does the record reflect your competency to have an opinion on this as an expert? Have you had intelligence experience with the Government?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I was designated by Supreme Headquarters, on orders signed by General Eisenhower, to plan the intelligence phase of the Berlin occupation in 1945. I did participate in it and was Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, in Headquarters.

Mr. ARENS. What was your rank?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Colonel in the infantry.

Mr. ARENS. In the CIC?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I had CIC under my command.

Mr. ARENS. You were Chief?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I was Chief of all American intelligence in Berlin.

Mr. ARENS. Now will you go ahead with your observations?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I should like to make further the observation that of our 14 NATO partners, none are making provisions to admit these people except under most stringent rules.

The problems of espionage have been on an increase in Western Europe. Espionage by people recently escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, that is. I think if you were to take the records, sir, for the last 3 years, you would find that almost doubling annually, and such records should be available to the committee from security sources.

Mr. ARENS. We did bring back some records with us.

Mr. HEIMLICH. I hope you did, because I am quite sure that will be borne out. Also, the records of the Western European police forces will bear that out.

As we move away from the highly civilized and highly organized police agencies of, let us say, Germany, France, and Italy, into the Mediterranean, this problem becomes many times multiplied, because the movements of people, also, over the past 25 years have been such that a continuous record of their activities is almost impossible to ascertain. So at the very best, we shall have to accept them on their own evaluation. I think that some exceptions can be made to that in that we may be able to take a reading, as it were, on those who have been in Western Germany, for example, since the end of the war. We will have the advantage of 8 years.

Senator WATKINS. What would you say, for instance, about the Polish flyer who just landed over in Denmark bringing a Russian jet plane, and is now being the subject of legislation before the Congress?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Well, I think that conforms exactly to what General Clark offered out in the Far East, too.

Senator WATKINS. Do you think, as a practical matter, we are going to be able to know much about his background?

Mr. HEIMLICH. He has already demonstrated his reasonable security, I think. He is reasonably disaffected. He has committed an act of treason against his government. I don't suspect we will find 240,000 who have done that sir.

Senator WATKINS. I know that the smartest operators in the field sometimes put themselves in the position where they appear to be going against their own government in order to be taken in wholeheartedly and see whatever we have. I am in favor of accepting this young man under a private bill. We have one before our committee but we have not had a report from the Department of Justice.

As greatly as I admire his courage and all that sort of thing, I know there is still a possibility, a bare possibility probably, that the Russians might have attempted to put something over on us.

I doubt that the committee, as much as we favor bringing him in, due to our emotions, and everything else, would be justified in accepting him without a report on him.

Mr. HEIMLICH. I agree with you.

Senator WATKINS. We have not had it yet, incidentally, and we are waiting for it now, in order to make a report on the bill which I think will be favorable if the report is favorable.

Mr. HEIMLICH. That is going at it the hard way, to get an agent in the United States.

Mr. ARENS. What would be the difficulty, if any, in ascertaining the security issue with reference to people coming in from behind the Iron Curtain, on the basis of your experience?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Do you mean if we were to take an individual, Hans Schmidt, and try to find out what he had done?

Mr. ARENS. Take 240,000 for screening. Do you have any appraisal to make on the security phase of the work, on what could be done?

Mr. HEIMLICH. There is no possible way in which the Western authorities can examine the police records or other political records of individuals who come from behind the Iron Curtain, unless they are officials who have brought such records with them. That is not as farfetched as it sounds. It has taken place. The ordinary individual, however, comes usually with only what he has on his back, perhaps his identification card, and perhaps not. Quite often they come without that or throw it away.

The background checks which we could assume necessary for positions in the United States Government, let us say, are completely impossible to make. There is no way at all that they can be made except in those cases where they have been resident in Western Europe for a period since war's end.

As you know, much of the records were destroyed during the war, not only in Germany, where they were almost totally destroyed, except for the records of the Nazi Party, but also in France where the records were destroyed by the Germans during the occupation.

Mr. ARENS. I understood you to say a while ago you were over in Europe recently on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I did not say what I was doing. I was over there to look into certain aspects of the European situation which the committee was interested in.

Mr. ARENS. It was a confidential operation, was it?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I should like it to remain so here; yes.

Mr. ARENS. I did not mean to request you to violate a confidence.

Did you bring back statistics with you, Mr. Heimlich, with reference to percentages of persons in the categories of refugees coming in from behind the Iron Curtain that the intelligence operatives would classify in the security risk category?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I heard many things. This was not my business to look into it officially. I heard many things from ex-associates and colleagues, including German police. There were statements as high as 30 percent. I doubt that, really, because in my visits in the camps of western Berlin and Western Germany—and I might say I speak the language fluently—in talking with these people by the hundreds, I think that a percentage that high would be almost impossible because of the large number of elderly women and very young children.

Of the military-age men, and there were quite a few of them, it is highly possible that they have been sent over with a mission. However, it would be a very low-grade mission, I should say, because at least if I were planning the operation to penetrate the American Government, I wouldn't go at it with people of the general category I saw.

Mr. ARENS. Did you get any information with respect to percentage of persons in criminal category as distinguished from subversive categories?

Mr. HEIMLICH. No. However, those figures are available to the committee through the proper sources.

Mr. ARENS. We brought back some on both of them. I wondered what your information was.

What did you say about the espionage cases?

Mr. HEIMLICH. The espionage cases have been on a steady rise since, really, the airlift in Berlin. As the airlift ceased, the efforts to penetrate into Western Europe were considerably accelerated and particularly since the West German Government has outlawed the Communist Party.

Mr. ARENS. Would the espionage case be a case of an individual who was engaged in espionage in Western Germany or Western Austria, or would it be a case of just a person who was an espionage agent and he came across and they grabbed him?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I like to deal with facts in these matters, sir. The cases I am thinking of, and the percentage rises I am thinking of, are of those people convicted either in United States courts or German courts.

Mr. ARENS. What could this committee do from the standpoint of writing legislation to give a maximum degree of assurance that in this category of 240,000 persons who are embraced in this legislation, there would be a maximum of screening out of the undesirables, the criminals and subversives? I probably posed my question clumsily, but I think you have the point.

Mr. HEIMLICH. I think the provisions of the McCarran Act, although I am not thoroughly familiar with it, would probably go far with it. But certainly the minimum should be a clearance of the country they are now resident, and of the security personnel of the United States, although this poses a tremendous job upon the security personnel.

Mr. ARENS. Could the security agencies undertake to ascertain whether or not these people, any of them or all of them, are in the criminal or subversive category? To what extent would their appraisal necessitate information from behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Well, of course, if they have recently come over, and they are coming over at a fantastic rate, there is no way in the world to check their backgrounds because such background checks would require, as in normal procedure, conversation with their employers, with their associates, their neighbors, the police records, their school records, and so forth, as we normally check such things in the United States.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Heimlich, may I ask you this: Did you observe in your study over there, and I do not know yet what it is, and I am not going to ask you what it is because you say it is confidential, did you observe that there appeared to be a difference in the security problem and criminal problem on those persons who were coming into Berlin as distinguished from those who were coming in along the Iron Curtain outside of Berlin?

Mr. HEIMLICH. In Western Berlin I was told that the security problem insofar as crime was concerned was far less now than it was at the end of the war when we had large numbers of displaced persons in Western Berlin, and it is quite evident that that is true because you do not see police around the refugee camps in Western Berlin as we used to see them around our displaced-persons camps.

There is no evidence of black marketing or that sort of thing. I believe that there is a very small criminal element among these people, to be perfectly honest about it. As for the possibilities of espionage or of escape from behind the Iron Curtain for the purpose of reporting upon our activities, there is almost no way of determining whether a person is there for that purpose. He would look like anyone else. He would not carry any special identification, or it is quite likely he could not. For that reason, he presents a very difficult case. It is like trying to determine in this room who might have stolen a purse out in the hall. It is a process of elimination.

Mr. ARENS. You said awhile ago something about the displaced-persons program. Were you over there when the displaced-persons program was being administered?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. What were you then?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I was assistant chief of staff, G-2, Berlin, for 2 years. I then became a deputy chief of the political branch, office of military government, United States as General Howley's assistant for political matters.

Mr. ARENS. Did you know about intelligence problems in the displaced-persons program?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes. We were quite intimately associated with that.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have anything to say on the basis of that experience, what might have gone on, which might be helpful to this committee?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I should only like to say that there were, during my tenure as chief of intelligence in Berlin, daily cases of attempts made to penetrate our installations or to go by our displaced-persons camps or to get by our consulate. We provided the screening facilities, for

example, for the United States consulate in Berlin, and we also operated the international document center where we were able to weed out most of those who had had Nazi affiliations.

But the others, those who were working for a power which had been allied and which was presently unfriendly, there was almost no way to get them except through detailed interrogations in the displaced persons camps proper. I think the records of the United States Army security agencies will bear out that it was one of our most difficult matters to cope with in Western Berlin, at any rate. As a matter of fact, it became so serious that we often had incidents developing there that required the attention of the offices as high as the Council of Foreign Ministers.

Mr. ARENS. What was your period of time over there?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I was in Berlin proper from the time of the Potsdam Conference on up until October 1949. I have been back several times since.

Mr. ARENS. You were there then during the peak period of the administration of the displaced persons program, were you not?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Have you had any occasion to study or read the hearings, run by the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate, on the operation of the displaced persons program?

Mr. HEIMLICH. No, sir, except what was in the newspaper.

Mr. ARENS. Is there anything else that you feel would be helpful to the committee? I apparently interrupted you in your presentation, Mr. Heimlich.

Mr. HEIMLICH. I only wanted to make these points clear: that we are not very sure of what a refugee is any more than we are sure of what a spy is; that the screening of these individuals abroad, either for criminal or for other tendencies, is one of extreme difficulty; that it will require a very great deal of hard work on the part of a hard-pressed staff of security people abroad to determine the security of individuals who might be coming to the United States.

Mr. ARENS. How much time would you say ought to be taken per case in order to be reasonably sure?

Mr. HEIMLICH. It is impossible to determine, Mr. Arens, but I would say that our normal experience has been that we could not clear anyone with less than about 3 months.

Mr. ARENS. They had a limit at one time, an administrative limit in the displaced persons program of 10 days per person, did you know that?

Mr. HEIMLICH. No, I did not, because we could not possibly have certified to the clearance of any individual on that short notice, even an individual in the United States.

Mr. ARENS. Less than 3 months?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I should say that is about right. That is about what our security people will require in the United States.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you this question: Is there not a difference in the security problem in various categories of persons in Europe? In other words, we move down into Italy, say, and we would have people there that had been living there for 5 or 10 years. You could ascertain pretty well what their situation is?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Did you observe that in your operations?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, I tried to make that clear. Wherever we have individuals who have been continuously in one country since the end of the war, it simplifies the matter very greatly. But you also have the case of individuals who leave, let us say, Western Germany and then come back into Western Germany and you do not have an idea where they have been nor do you have liaison with police agencies on where they have been.

Mr. ARENS. One gentleman wrote this, as a suggested question, about the security risk of escapees as compared to expellees.

Mr. HEIMLICH. That gets into a very high subject. If you have an expellee whom you have reason to believe is a genuine expellee, let us say, Gerhard Eisler, who is now in difficulty with the Berlin Government, then we would be confronted with the problem of what we would do with that man. Is he more dangerous to us in Western Germany than he is here?

Mr. ARENS. I suppose the interrogator here has this in mind, at least I do, that in the Potsdam Agreement of August 1945, they agreed to, and threw out of the Eastern European countries, anybody who had German blood in his veins. That was in 1945, 1946, and 1947, basically. Would not those people, as a group, not as an individual, but as a group, would not they constitute less of a security risk than people who are coming in in recent months or in recent years?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I don't know. Of course, we can't say particularly any single group.

Mr. ARENS. I did not mean as individuals, I meant as a group. There are millions of them.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Of course, I think if you have, let us say, the Sudetenland Germans who are in Western Germany now, who have been well absorbed and are doing a good job and seem to be adding a great deal to the Western German economy, but the Sudetenland German who might be coming in now, the question might be whether or not they are peasants who are being forced to give up their lands by reason of "land reform" or whether they are people who are deliberately sent over.

There is one thing that I did observe that might interest the committee. That was that of about 300 people to whom I talked in one of the large camps in western Berlin, only 1 individual wanted to emigrate. The others want to return to their homes. These, of course, are the peasants. These are the people who are the small farmers and the small shop owners and so forth. They have no desire to leave their homeland. They want to go back to it.

Of course, you have the situation now where much of Eastern Europe, particularly in Silesia, Mecklenburg, and western Poland is really denuded of people. The fields are lying fallow because there is no one there to farm.

Mr. ARENS. Colonel, may I ask you this: Let us assume that you, on the basis of your experience, were assigned to investigate right here in the United States whether or not I am a Communist, Richard Arens, whether I am a Communist or under Communist discipline. What would be necessary so that you could be reasonably satisfied to make a report to somebody as to whether or not I ought to be issued a visa to go some place. What would you do?

Senator WATKINS. I wonder if you can answer that question without disclosing classified information?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I think we can answer some things. We would certainly start with determining whether you were Richard Arens. We would work back from there, your school and associates and so forth.

Mr. ARENS. Would you have to get into my background some years prior?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes. If we were going to, let us say, determine whether or not you should handle highly classified information, we would want to know a great deal about you since you were a boy, probably.

Mr. ARENS. What would you do if you wanted to ascertain whether or not I am a criminal?

Mr. HEIMLICH. We would go to the police agencies and find out.

Mr. ARENS. Could you explain to the committee what is meant by the word "dormant" in Communist circles?

Mr. HEIMLICH. That is much like—

Mr. ARENS. That is a word we have used in our internal security work, and our staff services both committees.

Mr. HEIMLICH. It is a word also used in police work. Dormant has much the same meaning, I think, in connection with the background of an individual, or an individual's potentialities, which it might have in connection with a spore, a vegetable spore, or even an animal spore. It is a potential that can be developed when the conditions are right. In other words, an individual may go through life and never commit a crime. But if the conditions are precisely right for that individual, the temptation comes, and the need exists, then he might cease to be dormant and become active.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any information respecting the dormancy of the Communists in the Western European areas?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I doubt that there is such a thing, but there certainly exists in many of the Western European countries, particularly now I believe Italy, because of certain internal pressures, a very strong and hardly dormant Communist Party, which penetrates into every phase of the national life. It is also true in France.

Mr. ARENS. Did you get to Italy?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Did you make inquiry in Italy about the availability of good security information, police records and so forth?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, that is available there. It is available in Italy.

Mr. ARENS. Did you get into Holland, the Netherlands?

Mr. HEIMLICH. No, I was in France, Austria, Italy, and Germany.

Mr. ARENS. Did you have an opportunity to observe the procedures from the standpoint of security on the questioning of refugees, newly arrived refugees, and the transmitting of that information to a central agency?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, it differs somewhat with the various countries. Some of it is performed by the nationals of the countries concerned, some of it by refugees themselves, the preliminary screening or later, and some by our own agencies.

Mr. ARENS. What about the manpower situation of the CIC or CIA?

Mr. HEIMLICH. They always make the complaint that they are understaffed, and I guess they are. It depends upon the amount of pressures put on them. But certainly there are not enough people to

cope with that alone. They would have to depend largely upon the local police. It is also true that we would depend largely upon our colleagues, and French and British intelligence. The French, of course, are the only ones who are using these escapees, refugees, and labor pools that exist—they are using them in the French Foreign Legion.

As a matter of fact, for a national of any of the Iron Curtain countries to obtain a visa for a visit to England through Western Germany is almost impossible.

Mr. ARENS. Say that again, I did not get that.

Mr. HEIMLICH. The obtaining of a visa to any of the other North Atlantic Treaty organizations, to visit one, for a national of an Iron Curtain country or even for a Western German, is extremely difficult. And for an Eastern German, it is almost impossible. They are not considering the matter of immigration, except, I believe, Canada.

Senator WATKINS. Is there a difference, in your opinion, in the risk between expellees and escapees?

Mr. HEIMLICH. It is very difficult to say, Senator. I believe we would deal only with individual cases there, to determine whether or not the man or woman was a security risk. In many of the cases of expellees there are political considerations which come in. The security people, after all, try to provide as much fact as they can. They do not make the decision. The decision then would rest with others.

It may be compared, I think, sir, to a military operation. The G-2 intelligence officer attempts to get all possible information as to the location of hostile troops, their condition, their morale, their armaments. The decision to fight them, however, is made by the commander or by operations officers.

Mr. ARENS. Here is an individual that yesterday came in from behind the Iron Curtain, exclusive of the Berlin group, and you are the intelligence man to check on him and make a recommendation to the reporter here as to whether or not he ought to be admitted into the United States on a visa. If you do not have any information on him and cannot get any information on him, what do you say in a case like that? Do you clear him or not clear him, what do you say?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Of course I would not clear him. I would not take the responsibility for that individual. But I would try, through interrogation, to find if he had any acquaintances, any friends, any relatives, anybody in Western Europe who was available and on whom we did have records and who might become creditable witnesses.

Mr. ARENS. How long might that take?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Again, it might take months, it might take a much longer time.

Mr. ARENS. What would be your estimate of manpower, people who are going to question people, go around and ask their neighbors about them, what would be your estimate of the manpower needed to process 240,000 persons in the refugee category in Europe?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Do you mean in 1 year, to process all of them in 1 year?

Mr. ARENS. Two years.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Well, you could figure on double that number to be screened, undoubtedly, or at least, because you certainly are not going to take the first 240,000 who come up. You won't take the first 75,000

in Italy. You will have other considerations. You will have considerations other than their desire to come to the United States.

Senator WATKINS. The staff member is assuming that we are going to bring 240,000. That is the possibility. We may not find 240,000 that can pass the stringent features of the McCarran Act as well as the present act. The McCarran Act is in full force and effect except as otherwise provided in this present act. That does not mean that you are actually going to get 240,000 people. It means within 2 years, if there are that number that apply and you can find them and they can pass all these tests, they have the authority to bring that many over, to admit them.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. What would be your manpower to process on security investigations 240,000 people in the refugee category as distinguished just for the purpose of this question from the nonrefugee question?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I don't add a bridge score very well, but I think that I certainly would not assign a single individual more than five cases at a time. Assuming it took him up to a minimum of 60 days for each case, he would have 5 cases every 60 days. That would be 30 cases per individual per year, roughly, or 60 over the 2 years. I am beginning to get into a problem.

Senator WATKINS. You are assuming that a lot of these people are minor children?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, sir; I would assume that they were families.

Senator WATKINS. And some elderly people and all that sort of thing?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. You wouldn't have to make the same kind of an examination on all of the 240,000 as you would on the head of the family, would you?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Of course not, but you would on the adult members.

Senator WATKINS. That is true. The adult members and particularly those that would come within the category you named awhile ago—of military age.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. In other words, the whole 240,000 would not have to have anywhere near the same scrutiny as individual cases had?

Mr. HEIMLICH. You are quite right. Let us say you, Senator Watkins, had a constituent who was extremely eager to get a certain individual in and was applying some pressures to get that individual, and suddenly a doubt occurs as to whether this individual should be in.

Senator WATKINS. If it is a reasonable doubt, I should think we could tighten the legislation to make it possible for you to stop there.

Mr. HEIMLICH. That would make it much simpler.

Senator WATKINS. That is one of the considerations. This bill, of course, is written for the purpose of getting something before us. It will undoubtedly be amended before we get through.

Mr. HEIMLICH. I say again, sir, what I said at the outset: That the humanitarian considerations are aside from what I wanted to contribute here. I wanted to contribute only the security side of it.

Senator WATKINS. I want to ask a question that has to do with security, too, and our general policy which you have no doubt had experience with.

We have been conducting the Voice of America programs for a number of years and it is supposed to tell the truth about the United States and the free world—to show how much better it is than the other world. Is that not the general objective?

Mr. HELMLICH. That is certainly one of them.

Senator WATKINS. And to discourage the people who live in the other world with the governments they have, even to the point, probably, of open rebellion against them—at least, building up an underground; is that right?

Mr. HELMLICH. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. And that propaganda would be rather effective in getting people, we hope, disgusted with the Communist regimes.

Mr. HELMLICH. It has been effective.

Senator WATKINS. And it might encourage a lot of them—and probably would—if they could not see any chance to rebel or do anything there, to get out of that country.

Do you think we ought to do anything about a situation where we have actually encouraged people to escape from that country or should we just let them stay in the countries they escape to in the free world and let them take over the burden?

Mr. HELMLICH. Of course, there are several schools of thought on that.

Senator WATKINS. There may be. What I am trying to find out is the answer. I see, on one hand, that we are carrying on a line of propaganda, sending information—and I am quite sure it is effective, at least I am voting for it on the theory it is; I voted for the appropriations—in which we try to discourage the entire populace of these various countries behind the Iron Curtain with what they have. That is with the idea in mind that some day or other they will, by the process of the ballot or otherwise, whatever way is open to them, cure that situation.

I hope we are so effective that we can get them so disgusted with what they have that if they cannot do it within their country they want to get out. Now, if we bring them to the countries on the borders, particularly in Europe, in the free world of Europe, Western Germany, France, and Italy, and the other countries there, we get them over there and then what are we going to do with them? Are we going to let them stay there as a burden on those people who have already absorbed millions of people?

The West Germans, as I understand it on reliable testimony from Gen. Bedell Smith, have taken about 8 million people already, they have absorbed them. They are not trying to export any of those over here. But they keep on coming, keep on coming, the same kind of people. So the problem is now presented of trying to do something about those people that are encouraged by our own propaganda to get out of Russia, to get out from behind the Iron Curtain. That is one of the big problems we have.

A good many of our people have been talking on the subject here, and have not given us any answer whatever to that problem, except they say send them to Africa, or Australia, or some place else, where they have a lot of land. That is all well and good, to tell people and urge them to take them. But unless we do a little something in that direction, people in charge of our psychological warfare, and even the Commander in Chief himself, believes we are not going to get

anywhere with that kind of a program. All talk and no action will certainly not bring results.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Heimlich, if it takes, on your estimate—

Senator WATKINS. I wonder if he has any comment before I get through with that. Have you any suggestion with respect to that, whether we ought to stop that type of program, encourage them to stay in the countries, or whether we should encourage them to come out?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Again, sir, I will say that most of the people who are probably the most desirable types from the standpoint of their industry, intelligence, and what-not, want to return to their homes more than anything else. I think we have done more than any people in the world in all history to alleviate suffering among these people, and to help to rehabilitate them. I have tried hard to avoid comment on what these humanitarian aspects may be.

My only concern here is that we make the job as light as possible for our own future security in determining that those who do come, or those who do contribute to the United States in one way or another or are helped by the United States, do not in any way work to our disadvantage.

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask you this question. This is a matter of security. Would these people who have escaped and are expellees from behind the Iron Curtain be more dangerous in the event of war to the free nations if they remain in Europe rather than be taken to some of the free countries themselves? That is, outside of Europe?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Well, sir, I think most of the people I have seen, would become a tremendous military factor if armed and trained and allowed to return. In fact, this is a completely personal observation.

Senator WATKINS. Do you mean allowed to return where?

Mr. HEIMLICH. To their homeland, to go back and fight for it, if it were a military operation. But my belief is that if we were to rearm Germany, for example, simply to announce that Germans of whatever section of Germany who presented themselves at a time and a place, that we would have the manpower for a German army overnight and we would denude Eastern Germany of its eligible young men.

Senator WATKINS. Could they get through? Could they get out?

Mr. HEIMLICH. There is a lot of talk about how difficult it is to cross the Iron Curtain. In the past 2 months I have crossed it twice, quite unofficially, without any difficulty.

Mr. ARENS. Do you mean in Berlin or elsewhere?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Elsewhere. You can cross it in Berlin legally. You could, up until a month ago, cross it for a 5-cent streetcar ticket.

Senator WATKINS. Now we are talking of security, and that is the principal purpose of your appearance before the committee. It is a well-known fact, I assume it is, if the papers are telling the truth and officials are telling the truth, when they say we have a large number of Communists in West Germany, France, and Italy. It was admitted here that about 40 percent of the voters in Italy voted for the Communist Party. Certainly they are not keeping all the Communists out of the armed forces of France or Italy, and they probably will not be able to keep them out of the armed forces in West Germany.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Of course, I am interested in keeping them out of our forces.

Senator WATKINS. We are probably keeping them out of our forces, but our forces are now a part, at least those who have gone over since the occupation, of the NATO army. That is a European army, is it not?

Mr. HEIMLICH. That is right, sir.

Senator WATKINS. And they will be in with our forces along with the rest of them in that NATO army.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Of course, we had a good example of what can happen through subversion in armed forces in France in 1940.

Senator WATKINS. Yes; we had an excellent example. The way the thing is shaping up there now as a security matter what is to prevent the same thing happening again when you would at least have a possibility of 33.3 percent of them being Communists even in the French Army?

Mr. ARENS. Do you think NATO is penetrated over there?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Certainly. It must be assumed that it is. I should say it should be assumed that any government or even business office is penetrated by Communist intelligence.

Mr. ARENS. I mean extensively.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, certainly potentially.

Mr. ARENS. I say extensively.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Do you think it is extensively penetrated?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I have no way of answering that, because I have nothing whatever to do with it. But on the basis of experience to say yes, I would guess that certainly a strong effort had been made to penetrate it.

Mr. ARENS. Would the Communists themselves make strong efforts to send agents into the West from the East?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes; that we know to be the fact.

Senator WATKINS. I would like to finish, if I may, the line of questioning I started out with. With respect to the security risk we now have with Communists who get into the forces of our allies who are part of the NATO: It has been reported, I think on rather good authority, that at least 25 percent of the forces which will guard the airfields that we have been building in that area that cost the American taxpayers, will probably be Communists. They talk about risk, they tell me that is a calculated risk.

Mr. HEIMLICH. Sir, I should like to not touch on that subject but to recommend if you are interested in it, that the committee request testimony from the Air Force security agencies. They have some that might be of value.

Senator WATKINS. That is a very good suggestion. But that is more or less common talk; it has been discussed time and time again. I take it you would rather not discuss it?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. We got some of that for the Internal Security Subcommittee when we were over there.

Senator WATKINS. What we are facing, of course, in the mixed situation as we have in Europe, is the possibility of infiltration into the very core of our Armed Forces over there. No matter what we do, we are always faced with that as long as we have official Communist Parties or Communist Parties in the underground in the nations who are our allies. Is that not true?

Mr. HEIMLICH. That is correct, sir.

Senator WATKINS. We will have that all the time. This would only be another part of the problem and probably a lot of women, children, and aged people involved that might not be quite so dangerous.

Mr. HEIMLICH. As a matter of fact, sir, one of our allies, now, is a Communist nation.

Senator WATKINS. Of course, we are in some sort of an organization with all the Communist nations except Red China.

Mr. HEIMLICH. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. Colonel, you estimate here on the manpower needs to screen 240,000 people approximately 60 cases for 2 years per man. If they were to screen 460,000 people to get 240,000, your manpower then would be about 8,000 agents, would it not?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I assume your figures are right.

Mr. ARENS. You take 60 and divide it into 240,000 and you come out with 4,000. You would screen out some, probably 50 percent, would you not? You would have to have about 8,000 agents on the basis of your calculations?

Mr. HEIMLICH. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. Is that a fair appraisal of the manpower needs of trained intelligence operators to handle these cases?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, on the basis I gave you, yes.

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of your experience?

Mr. HEIMLICH. That is about right.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know whether or not 8,000 CIC, CIA, or intelligence men are available there?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I do not know.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know what the manpower situation is on the intelligence operatives we have in Europe?

Mr. HEIMLICH. No, I don't.

Senator WATKINS. And if you did know, you would not be in a position to testify with respect to that?

Mr. HEIMLICH. In all respect, no, sir. However, it is a colossal problem. As the Senator pointed out, you do have the advantage of not having to screen the children, at least a considerable number of those people. On those, however, where you do screen, I think our estimate that you will screen twice as many people as you will actually pass, is a very liberal estimate.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any suggestions to make to the committee on the basis of your experience and observations of the DP program as to where the burden of proof ought to be and as to where the doubts ought to be resolved?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Particularly on those individuals where we have no check for the past 5 years, the burden of proof should be on the individual.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with the calculated risk theory that was involved in the DP program for a while?

Mr. HEIMLICH. Yes, and I am thoroughly opposed to it.

Mr. ARENS. Do you think it was dangerous to the security of the United States of America?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I think the record will show that it was, yes.

Senator WATKINS. May I add that this committee was also opposed to it? The committee is already on record with respect to it, the older

members. We have some new members but I am certain I can speak for them that we are all opposed to the calculated risk of just taking them in flocks and bringing them over. It is not contemplated by the sponsors of this bill that anything of that kind would be done.

Mr. HEIMLICH. I am glad to hear that.

Senator WATKINS. It is contemplated that the provisions of the McCarran Act will be enforced with respect to this screening process, and the only exceptions are indicated in the bill itself. But the bill itself provides that it is to be done within the framework of the McCarran Act.

Mr. HEIMLICH. I see.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any access to information that you could supply the committee as to whether or not these estimated 8,000 investigators are available or a part of them are available, or what ought to be done in that field to assure this committee that there would be adequate manpower to make sufficient security investigations?

Mr. HEIMLICH. I think the Committee could determine that quite easily by contacting the proper security officers here in Washington.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Heimlich.

Mr. Heimlich, you may be recalled by the committee. I have in mind an appearance in executive session.

Mr. HEIMLICH. All right, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Anderson had a little appendage that he wanted to make to his statement of yesterday.

COMMUNICATION OF CRETE ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF THE NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON S. 1917, SPECIAL QUOTA IMMIGRATION VISAS, IN ADDITION TO TESTIMONY PRESENTED ON MAY 27, 1953

The American Legion deeply regrets that, in this limited area of the many problems now confronting the President, they are at variance with him. Of the 3 million members of the American Legion, a large percentage of them served under the capable and courageous leadership of General Eisenhower in World War II. As President of the United States, he is our most distinguished member. The older members of the American Legion respect him to a degree beyond possible enhancement. And the younger members, the GI's love and respect "Ike" to a degree akin to worship. The American Legion is confident that the President is aware of all of this.

The American Legion further regrets that legislation so vital to the safety and welfare of the United States, as is the McCarran-Walter Act, should have been tossed into the political arena, as was done following passage over a Presidential veto. This has resulted in a state of confusion and misunderstanding on the part of many people in the United States, as to the principles, objectives and merits of this vital legislation.

Senator WATKINS. I think that is probably in response to a question I asked, if the President himself is not a member of the American Legion. Many American Legion members had indicated support for this particular measure. Of course, there is room for an honest difference of opinion, and that is what exists at the present time between the President and at least the officialdom of the American Legion.

I think at this point the committee will recess until 1:30. If those witnesses who are on the list for today will return at that time, we will try to get through as many as possible during the day. We are somewhat behind because of the lengthy statements and the lengthy examinations. It is not entirely the fault of the witnesses but of the committee itself.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p. m. the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

Senator WATKINS. The subcommittee will resume session.

The next gentleman is Mr. Louis Spiegler, Jewish War Veterans.

For the record, will you kindly state your name, address, and occupation or profession and whether or not you represent any organizations; if you do, the name of the organizations?

STATEMENT OF LOUIS E. SPIEGLER, ON BEHALF OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPIEGLER. My name is Louis E. Spiegler. My address is the Southern Building, Washington, D. C. I am an attorney at law and I represent the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

Senator WATKINS. Proceed.

Mr. SPIEGLER. I appear before you on behalf of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. It may interest you to know that this is the oldest war veterans' organization in America, with more than 100,000 members. On its behalf I want to express to you gratitude for the opportunity to submit briefly, its views on the legislation before you to wit, S. 1917.

The organization is interested in an immigration policy that will serve the best interests of the United States. We are not unaware that the several streams of immigration flowing into the United States contributed materially to what is America. We believe in a sound immigration policy. It is for that reason that we opposed the McCarran-Walter Act. As a matter of fact, we were hopeful that the Congress before now would have taken action to correct the inequities of that law.

Nevertheless, though with some reservations upon which I will touch later, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America support S. 1917 because it will relieve some of the stresses and strains in many overpopulated countries and because it will provide a haven of security and liberty to human beings. Above and beyond that, these immigrants, as the immigrants before them, will make a substantial contribution to the well-being of the United States. Time after time in the history of America, there have been waves of antagonism toward immigration based upon the fear and false assumption that America had reached its absorptive capacity. Time after time that fear and assumption has been completely disproved. And it will be thus again.

In addition to the fact that this bill will relieve some of the population stresses and strains in European countries friendly to us, it will also be an effective weapon in the fight against communism since it is a well-known fact that overpopulated areas and countries where there is great poverty more readily fall prey to the wiles and promises of communism. This bill, if enacted into law, will therefore lend economic, political, and psychological strength in our war on communism.

Since World War II we have spent perhaps close to \$30 billion on foreign relief and aid. The passage of this bill will cost us no money.

Instead we will receive inestimable benefits in the form of human resources—an investment which has always paid off.

A sound immigration policy would involve a complete overhauling of the McCarran-Walter Act. S. 1917 provides a slight palliative for some of the inequities of that act. It would ease some of the resentments aroused by that act.

We offer for the committee's consideration a number of specific suggestions as follows:

1. The bill provides for a total immigration, over a 2-year period, of 240,000 persons, among them being 15,000 persons called Iron Curtain escapees, living in NATO countries, Turkey, and Trieste. The suggestion I wish to make is that the unused portions of the quotas in any of the other categories at the expiration of the 2-year period be made available to this category; that is in addition to the 15,000 mentioned, because it is believed a considerably larger number of escapees reside in those areas. The suggestion is further made that the word "refugees" be substituted for "escapees" because it is a broader, more humane, and less technical definition.

2. In our judgment the bill fails to provide relief for refugees or stateless persons in the United States. It is a contradiction for the Congress to create a haven of refuge and security in this country for persons from abroad while at the same time the Department of Justice through the Immigration and Naturalization Service is diligently endeavoring to expel or deport from this country persons who in many cases are refugees or displaced persons and who came to the United States as students, temporary visitors, and so forth. Would it not be consistent to amend this bill by considering them in a general category of displaced persons or refugees, particularly those who are natives or nationals or last residents of these countries which this legislation is designed to relieve?

3. We question the wisdom of the severity of the good-faith affidavits which we believe could easily deteriorate into peonage practices which could be used by unscrupulous employers who will see the financial gain accruing to them from such practices, knowing the alien is always at their mercy, held by fear, at least until he is naturalized.

4. Another suggestion is: That those persons who qualified under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 but who lost their chances solely because of the expiration of that act, be granted visas under any and all of the five categories, depending on where they are resident, not excluding the United States.

5. The suggestion is also made that the Commission appointed to administer, be granted some discretionary authority to avoid the barring of deserving aliens within the categories simply because of some technicality in documentation or otherwise, for often the spirit of the law is nullified for lack of discretion in the administrative agency.

6. We strongly urge that this bill should provide that anyone who was an active, practicing Nazi, Fascist, or Communist should be denied the benefits of this act.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Spiegler.

Mr. SPIEGLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Charles E. Babcock.

Will you state for the record your name, your place of residence, your occupation, or profession and if you represent any organization, indicate the name of the organization.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES E. BABCOCK, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, JUNIOR ORDER OF UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS, ACCOMPANIED BY JAMES L. WILMETH, SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE

MR. BABCOCK. My name is Charles E. Babcock. I live at Vienna, Va. I am chairman of the national legislative council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States. I am here at the request of the united board of officers, the executive body, between the biennial session of the national congress.

With me this morning is Mr. James L. Wilmeth. He is a representative of the junior order.

Shall I proceed?

SENATOR WATKINS. You may proceed. Notwithstanding the name, this is not a labor organization; it is a fraternal organization?

MR. BABCOCK. It is strictly a patriotic organization.

Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Junior Order, United American Mechanics, America's oldest patriotic fraternity, appreciates the opportunity you have given us to present our views on S. 1917, which is a bill to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special-quota immigration visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, introduced by Senator Watkins, May 15, 1953.

This bill specifically authorizes the issuance of 110,000 visas to escapees and German expellees living in the area of the German Federal Republic, or in the western sectors of Berlin, or in Austria; 15,000 visas to escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty, or in Turkey, who are not nationals of the areas in which they reside; 75,000 visas to nationals of Italy or persons of Italian ethnic origin; 20,000 visas to nationals of Greece or persons of Greek ethnic origin, and 20,000 visas to nationals of the Netherlands or persons of Dutch ethnic origin.

Our fraternity is opposed to this proposed legislation. Our main reason is that we are not able to determine how the admission of this number of immigrants in the categories listed will be of any benefit whatsoever to the people of the United States or to our economy.

The Displaced Persons Act is a kind of foot-in-the-door entrance for legislation like S. 1917. This conclusion is supported by the flood of like bills introduced into the 83d Congress. Three Senate bills, namely S. 1186 to admit 328,000; S. 1379 to admit 300,000, and S. 1917 to admit 240,000, have been introduced which, if enacted into law, would bring in 868,000 migrant immigrants. During the same period of time the House has received 6 bills, namely, H. R. 337 for 300,000; H. R. 1707 for 300,000; H. R. 2076 for 328,000; H. R. 3845 for 328,000; H. R. 4842 for 380,000, and H. R. 4925 for 245,000, which, if they should all become laws, would bring in 1,881,000.

We are confident that the enactment of S. 1917 or any of the other bills introduced as emergency legislation will work a hardship on the American people and strain our economy in many ways.

The author of this present measure made a statement on the floor of the Senate that it is estimated there are 30 million refugees, escapees, expellees, and other classes of migrant people in the world

today. Can it be that the United States will be expected to take the lead and continue to bring in a stream of unnecessary, unneeded aliens? The author of the bill further stated that this measure is not intended as a program but as a gesture. We are very much concerned by this statement. It indicates strongly a program from the fact that 341,000 refugee-displaced persons were admitted during the 82d Congress under emergency legislation. Now, with 240,000 more to be admitted under S. 1917, if it should become a law, would amount to a total of almost 600,000 admissions regardless of lawful quotas. This is a staggering total and we are convinced that this trend of proposed new legislation bespeaks a policy and a program of far-reaching evil effects to the United States.

According to the annual report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, it is disclosed that from 1820 to 1952 there were 39,796,719 immigrant aliens admitted to the United States, and for the fiscal years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1910, 1913, 1914 there were more than a million received during each of these fiscal years. The absorption of this number of aliens by the United States sets a new record among the nations of the world. So far as we know, there has never been a similar hehira of peoples to become citizens of another country.

The classes of persons covered by this bill are not the kind we need, neither are they of the pattern of aliens that have been received in this country. The present outlook for relief of our citizens is not reassuring. The downward trend began with the displaced-persons law, and so long as Congress passes special acts for the relief of uprooted or overcrowded people, and so long as war abounds, we may expect no stop of this intake of aliens. There will be a constant flow of these undesirables for many years.

We have a great sufficiency of migrant people in this country today. It has only been a short time since legislation for the control and assistance of our own migrant people was introduced and discussed at length in the Senate. We see no reason to add to this horde of gypsylike people that we have with us now by bringing in those who will benefit by Senate bill 1917.

We are confident that, notwithstanding the bill is worded so that immigrants admitted under the act, if passed, will have supervision and assurances given that they will not flow from the rural sections to crowded cities, as they did under the Displaced Persons Act, it will be utterly impossible to control them, and it would require a large police force, or regulatory force, to control them, and it would be a constant source of irritation in the execution of the law.

Certain penalties are prescribed in section 6 (b) for aliens who violate or fail to accept in good faith employment or other arrangements, and the section goes so far as to say that the Attorney General may, upon certain findings of misstatement or misrepresentations by the alien in order to gain admission into the United States, arrest and cause to be deported such offenders. However, paragraph (d), assistance rendered an alien in connection with his transportation to and resettlement in the United States, shall not be regarded as cause for excludability as an alien likely to become a public charge.

The development of our quota immigration system and under the McCarran-Walter Act especially the quota system is based upon the selection of immigrants suited to the needs of our economy, and gives

preference to people of high education, special skills, and other accomplishments which will contribute something to the American way of life. Senate bill 1917 attempts feebly to establish rules of selectivity, such as farm laborers and others with special skills, but it occurs to us that it would be extremely difficult and almost impossible to determine amongst these classes of migrant people just who, or whether any of them could qualify if the provisions of the act were strictly followed. According to our way of thinking, the people to be benefited by this act do not follow the general rule of seeking a haven in the United States, where they can contribute something to the general welfare. Our observations are that migrant people do not live or move in the atmosphere of work and action that tends to make stabilized homeownership citizens. This applies more particularly to escapees, expellees, and refugees.

Regarding the admission of immigrants from overpopulated countries, we are definitely opposed to any legislative attempt on the part of the United States to relieve the overpopulation in Italy, or for that of any other country. It is a well-known fact that Italy is one of the most prolific of the civilized nations on the face of the earth. To establish and continue a policy of this kind would be ruinous and would, in the course of time, leave the States which comprise the United States in exactly the same situation as the nations that S. 1917 seeks to relieve. Overpopulation can be handled or managed in other ways by the nations involved, rather than to ship them here to become a probable burden on our American citizens just for the reason of helping out these nations in their dilemma. We do not believe that the people of the United States want to help people of these overpopulated countries. By proper management, these nations can overcome economic and population pressures to a large extent.

We submit that the Congress and the United States have done their fair share in relieving vexing refugee problems through the Displaced Persons Act. Some 340,000 were admitted by this special emergency displaced persons legislation. Those who are striving to increase immigration into the United States appear to be looking back to this Displaced Persons Act as a sample of what we ought to keep on doing. We are wondering when, if ever, the pressure will stop. The reports indicate that the handling of individual persons and groups in many cases under the administrative setup of the Displaced Persons Act was far from satisfactory both abroad and here in the United States. We may expect similar things to happen under the proposed admission of S. 1917 if it should be enacted into law.

There are other features of S. 1917 which are wrong in principle and should never be enacted into law, for instance, defraying the expenses of these people both before they reach our shores and afterward, and the provisions of the bill which authorize the Coordinator to make loans to these people. As we read the bill, escapees, expellees, refugees, and those from overpopulated countries will all share in the gratuities and assistance of this bill. If this is not a breakdown of the immigration laws, we do not understand what system might be adopted that will be more perfect in that respect.

It seems to be the idea of those who framed this bill that we must induce these people to come here regardless of whether they have money for expenses, or whether they will flock to the crowded cities

as have many of the displaced persons. It looks very much as if we are paying them to come here as immigrants.

We submit that all of these people will make better American citizens if they are put on their own until they can secure sufficient funds to defray their transportation expenses. The financial considerations of this bill will have a tendency to soften, demoralize, and eliminate the courage and independence of these people after admission and to make of them wanderers on the face of the earth.

We submit that there is no special need for this bill, nor for the admission of these people, and that the introduction of people of this class will lower the standards of the people of the United States, and if it is not curbed, in the long run we will suffer the same penalties as some of the imperial nations of former times, by reason of the admission of too many aliens.

Another danger arises from the opportunity for the introduction and spread of communism. It was stated before your honorable committee a few days ago that if this bill were enacted into law it would strike a death blow to communism. We do not share this view. Communists are smart enough to work their way into any situation, so that they may put over their propaganda, and there is but little doubt in our minds that the same thing will apply if this bill should become a law.

We urge that no loans or financial assistance shall be granted or extended to any alien immigrant from overpopulated areas or from Italy, Greece, or the Netherlands.

We do not like that part of the bill which establishes the Office of Coordinator and confers upon him entirely too much power in dealing with agencies other than that of the Government and other administrative features. It opens the way for abuse and the exercise of arbitrary power.

We submit further that 2 million American youths are graduating from high schools, colleges, and universities yearly and going out to make careers for themselves. These must have our protection and are entitled to first call on employment and jobs. Laws are enacted by Congress to protect certain American industries. Why not extend protection to the yearly oncoming youths? These are amongst our greatest possessions. They are entitled to a better fate than competition with migrants and other peoples of the Old World.

Recommendations:

(1) That this bill, S. 1917, be not favorably reported by your honorable committee.

(2) That in the event you should deem it wise or expedient to approve this measure, it should be amended by eliminating therefrom all reference to relief of overpopulation in Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands.

(3) That the Coordinator be directed to secure all his clerical force and assistants necessary to properly perform his duties from established Government agencies, and that any appointments he may make of personnel be taken from civil-service eligible registers.

(4) That the Coordinator perform his work in close cooperation with the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and that neither the Coordinator nor any of his assistants or employees shall authorize any admissions of aliens hereunder

except in the strictest conformity to established immigration laws governing the admission of aliens into the United States.

(5) That no political pressures or favoritism be applied in the matter of determining the status of an expellee, refugee, or escapee.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very much for your statement. We appreciate your courtesy in giving us your view.

Senator WATKINS. Senator Smith, do you have someone you wish to introduce? Do you wish to make a statement in your own behalf or do you wish to introduce someone?

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIS SMITH, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I learned last night for the first time that a distinguished citizen from my State has been delegated to represent a group of patriotic societies and I came to introduce him to the committee and present him.

In that connection I did want to call attention to the fact that as the chairman knows I was a member of a subcommittee, and I presume I was chairman since I was the one Democrat last year, who toured European countries. We did not just talk to officials of the governments but we actually went down into the camps. I saw myself and talked myself with some of the persons classified as refugees; at a camp outside of Rome there were about 200 as I recall.

At a camp outside of Athens there were probably 150.

At a camp outside of Istanbul there were probably a hundred, in that neighborhood.

There were some down in southern Italy. I did not visit the camp in Germany because I was detailed to go over to Bern as chairman of the American delegation attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference. But I am familiar with the record and I have the record here.

I know that our intelligence people over there gave us the information and some of it is here in this book. Some portions of it are confidential but other portions of it are not, at least I can say to you that the intelligence agents of America working over there told us that from their experience in Germany, and I am pointing my remarks now to the people in Germany who I understood wished to come over here, that about 35 percent, perhaps 40 percent—I notice quickly, I looked at the figures there and one page I turned to had 35 percent—of those who wished to come to America are subversives. They gave us a great deal of information on some of those they had had contacts with which demonstrated certainly to my satisfaction that many of the people that came in from behind the Iron Curtain over into Germany and would wish to get to America were in truth and in fact of subversive character.

I recall that some of our intelligence agents said it was quite impossible on the screening they gave them as they came from Germany from behind the Iron Curtain countries to tell those that were subversive and Communist and those that were not, the difficulty being that our agents could not tell on a short quick examination the character of these people.

Now, that made me feel then, and I have the same opinion now, that we should not rush to take in a horde of people that could well

become subversive agents and could do what I believe they would attempt to do in many cases, subvert the principles of the American Government and would act as agents against our type of life in America.

Now, I could elaborate a little more on that, but the chairman has this book at his disposal also, I am sure, and there may be some of the information in there that should not be at this time made public. I would not wish to do that.

I do want to say, though, Mr. Chairman, that in these camps that we attended we found that one of the troubles was that many of these men are willing to work, but under the laws of Italy and France, and I think some of the other nations as well, a human being has to go to some other human being to get a permit to work. To me that is unthinkable.

Senator WATKINS. They have to do that here in this country.

Senator SMITH. No; they do not. Not in North Carolina, because we have a right-to-work law that gives every human being a chance to work if he is willing to work.

Senator WATKINS. The reason I made that observation, they were building a steel plant in the neighborhood of my hometown. They called on all the citizens that they could get to come and said, "You farmers who may have a few weeks off who can come in the slack season, come down and help us build this plant." It was in the wartime. They were building plants for the purpose of manufacturing steel plate for the use of the Navy.

A number of the farmers thought that was a fine thing to do. They applied for jobs. They were not asking for the best jobs but they were told they had to go to a certain place in a neighboring town to get a permit before they could go to work in the defense plant. They went down to this neighboring town. It was a union headquarters. They had to go and buy a permit. It was not the union membership. They just gave them \$20 or \$25 for a permit to go down and work a few weeks. That is the reason I mentioned it.

Senator SMITH. I hope very much that is one objective that the Republican Party, since it is the majority party in Congress, will devote its attention to and correct that situation which my distinguished friend of the opposite party has recognized.

Senator WATKINS. With your help, maybe we can.

Senator SMITH. You can count on my help, I am sure, on anything that will protect the average American citizen in his right to work and earn his daily bread. But that is the situation over there, Mr. Chairman. It is quite serious.

Of course, they have arguments about that. I saw 2 or 3 people that I would think, if they were brought to this country, might be good citizens and good workers. I remember quite well because I spent some time talking to them personally. But I found, Mr. Chairman, that many of these people had been lured to cross the borders from their own countries. I am not talking about those that were subversive, but others that had been lured to cross their borders from this country to other countries just because they heard the broadcast and they were not capable of understanding which was the Voice of America, the British Broadcasting Co., and others. Some of them said, "We understood if we could get into this country and get out of our country, we would be offered all the glory and all the privileges of the demo-

cratic Western World," and many of them really thought we were there to pick them up and bring them to America. They were not refugees. They were not political refugees. They are people looking for a better life, and I cannot blame them for that, but they hoped to get out of their own countries and get to the western democracies.

I did not blame them for that. It seems to me the question is what is going to be best for America, what is going to be best for our type of civilization? After all, if we take so many people in this country that we cannot Americanize them, then we are moving toward the day when this Nation will have to break up into segments of different nationalities as Europe has done through the ages. I believe in taking in a reasonable number of immigrants, those who wish to come, to help build the Nation here and those who are willing to become Americanized and willing to devote their time and energy to learn and study the fundamentals of our concept of government, but I do not believe that that should carry us to the extent of taking in recklessly all of these people that are now planned to be brought here.

I noticed in the bill, and I could not help think of it when people say it is done for human beings, why is it limited to particular nations to such an extent?

Now, I was one who flew in a very small plane after I got to Beirut to Gaza, the old city where Samson of old held forth, and I had my picture made in front of his tomb because that was a most interesting experience, but I saw more than 200,000 Arab refugees living on the sands, just up from the Mediterranean Sea, with hardly enough food to keep body and soul together. I saw refugees in other places in that general vicinity. I know and you know and this committee knows that there are many penniless people in India, and there are many homeless and penniless people in China. Now, if the objective of this proposed legislation is to help human beings, why should we not take in Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Arabs, and others in whatever plan we adopt. It seems to me that this whole scheme of bringing in 240,000 people with the nationalities named is for purposes other than rendering just service to human beings but rather is for political purposes. I do not believe that we ought to frame our immigration law just for the purpose of political advantage of the Republican Party or Democratic Party.

Senator WATKINS. Would you be willing to waive your objections to the bill if these people that you think ought to be included were included?

Senator SMITH. No; I would not as long as we have a quota system and as long as we are going to maintain the present system, because we must bear in mind that while our quota law would allow 150,000 people to come into our Nation a year, that is what the law says, but we know there are those beyond the quota system and last year, if I am not badly mistaken, Mr. Chairman, I think America received into this country more than 250,000. Now, I am not certain.

Mr. ARENS. About 265,000, including nonquota cases and displaced persons.

Senator SMITH. I had occasion to appear some time ago at a Town Meeting of the Air in New York and I got the figures up at the time. When it said to the people that we take in 150,000, that is very mis-

leading because I know it was more than a quarter of a million. I think that is all that America can absorb and assimilate.

I said some time ago in discussing this matter in a friendly sort of way with some people, I said, "You can go down the street to so many of our citizens, block after block, and never hear a word of English spoken, our national language." I was met with the challenge, "Why should English be spoken in America?" Now, that is the type of people that are behind this legislation, people who want to change the whole character of America and change American institutions to that of nationalities other than English which have brought to us the great heritage of free institutions. I do not believe that we ought to take one single immigrant more than the present quota law provides for and I think it will take us now many years to assimilate those that are in our midst and those that are coming under the present law.

Now, just the other day the Senate passed a bill that I introduced to set up as a corporation a national conference on citizenship. That work was started by the Attorney General of the United States in 1946. I believe I was one of the first sponsors when I was president of the bar association, and I have great pride and great delight in helping with the work of that organization until now. We have it set forth in legislation to make it a corporation to help to work out plans for Americanizing these people and developing them into the citizens we would like to have them become.

But even if that bill passes the House and as I hope and expect it will, that will be but just one little effort toward Americanizing and assimilating these people that we are bringing to our shores.

Now we have before us one illustration of this recent origin. You remember back before the second World War became a reality there was a great democracy in Europe, Czechoslovakia, in which America was greatly interested, in which Dr. Mazaryk and Dr. Benes resided. I was a guest of Dr. Benes on one or two occasions in Prague. We thought and we believed that the people of that Nation were a great democracy, a great force for democracy in Europe but they made a mistake just prior to World War II of letting so many Germans come into their country that pretty soon we heard the claim made by the Germans, the Sudetenland ought to be German territory because it is inhabited by Germans. So it became German territory, so came about the holocaust that meant so much ruin to the world civilization and to our people, to our sons and daughters.

Now, I wish to accept and receive people who are in search of liberty and freedom, who want to follow through as we in America have attempted to follow through on our ideal, but I do not believe they should be allowed to crowd in here and in fact swamp our institutions before we can assimilate them. Therefore, I am very much opposed to this bill.

I have been interested in immigration because I happened to be placed on the committee when I first came to the Senate. I did not asked to be placed on the committee. I knew nothing about immigration, practically nothing. But I found pretty soon that it was quite a hot potato when handled by those who had immense foreign populations in their midst. All we have to do is to take the vote on the veto of President Truman and look at those who voted to sustain the President. I remember how I looked at several of my distinguished

colleagues of the opposite party, when I saw how they voted to uphold the veto of a Democratic President, and some of them I knew did not have their hearts in what they were doing. I do not believe we ought to have legislation that way. I believe when we come to a great thing dealing with immigration, we ought to bear in mind first the safety, the welfare of America, and then try to lend a helping hand to those that we think we can convert and transform into good American citizens.

I do not believe this bill is a bill that is properly conceived to start with, and I am not blaming the distinguished chairman for whom I have a real affection as he knows, but I do not believe this bill was conceived in the proper spirit because I know that the immigration subcommittee, some of the staff members have been working in an honest effort to see whether or not there were any changes that ought to be made in the present immigration law, but before they could even make a report, before even the report that our friend Mr. Blair has been working on for months was made to the Congress, we are faced with this piece of apparently hastily drawn legislation, a piece of legislation designed for just a few of the people of Europe and not for the homeless peoples of all the earth. That is another reason I am opposed to it.

I am so glad to hear that great organization of which I am a member, the American Legion, and all other organizations all over America, taking a stand on this thing. I said when the bill was first sent to Congress that I did not believe the President was familiar with the details and I still think that, because manifestly he cannot be familiar with all the details of all the various bills that come to Congress.

But I do believe it is the duty of those of us who have had some experience, who have gotten some facts, who have spent months as we did in Europe last year, I believe it is our duty to present to the Congress and to the public in every way we can the reasons that we feel as we do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is about all I wish to say.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask you a question, Senator? I have asked it of others.

The thing that is bothering me is what remedy would you propose for the situation created by our own broadcasts, the Voice of America, and free world broadcasts which induce people to escape from behind the Iron Curtain and cross the line of the first country that is adjacent to the Iron Curtain country. They get over the line and immediately they are burdens to the people next door. Those people happen to be our friends.

Now, I am confronted with this situation in my own mind: We either ought to try to cut out those broadcasts or else find some way to help those people who have to take the burden of it. Eight million Germans have been absorbed by West Germany. Mr. Adenauer, I understand from official sources, does not ordinarily care to part with any Germans, but he says he has more Germans than he can absorb. He has done his best to take care of them. They have gotten to the point now where so many people are coming that they cannot handle it. That is true in some of the other countries. This is a constructive question I am asking. What do you think we ought to do in a situation where apparently we are partly responsible for this vast horde

of people coming from behind the Iron Curtain? We make our broadcasts so attractive and tell them so many fine things, about democracies that they want to come, they do come.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have had serious misgivings about the type of broadcasts. I sat in a hearing one time about some of that. I am not sufficiently expert on that to advise you. But I do believe that just as long as we encourage people to come there, either by those broadcasts or by the passage of legislation of this sort, we are inviting disaster to America because if we pass this law, you know the word is going to be spread out through Europe, "Oh, yes, if you get into the other country, America will take you."

Mr. Chairman, last year, I think it was in Athens, Greece, a fine old gentleman interested in mission work and interested in education, came over to see me from Istanbul, and he talked about the Bulgarian refugees. He said,

If we can just get them out of Bulgaria and get them to American and English universities, what they can do is to go back and get the yoke of the Iron Curtain off their own people.

I asked him, "How will they do that?"

A man standing beside us said,

It can be done when an American Army goes to Bulgaria to rescue those people.

That was astonishing. The man who made the statement made it facetiously, but as quick as a flash this fine old gentleman who had pure ideals as far as he was concerned, said, "Fine, fine; that is what I want to see."

I said,

I will never vote for an American soldier to be sent to Bulgaria to rescue the Bulgarians if they can't rescue themselves.

So every time we do something of this sort, it perks up the hope of these people to come from their countries and come to America. We cannot take them all. We can have millions upon millions brought over here and still it is not going to relieve the population figure over there. They have to do something for themselves.

One of those small nations of Europe told me that their output each year of babies was enough to produce about 50,000 to 75,000 more citizens as the years went along than they could take care of.

Senator WATKINS. What country is that?

Senator SMITH. Holland.

Now, the Dutch are fine people. They are people we can assimilate. Yet they have a surplus population. I say that to prove the point it is not refugees, it is surplus population brought on in Europe. I do not know how we are ever going to cope with that situation unless we slice off a piece of America and say, "All right, take this."

I do not want any part of North Carolina sliced off for that purpose, and I do not believe the distinguished Senator from Utah wants that in his section of the country, although I know he produces great agricultural products.

Senator WATKINS. Incidentally, I think in my State probably three-fourths of the people there are immigrants or immigrant stock back to two generations.

Senator SMITH. Of course, we are all immigrants in a way, but I think the immigrants from which most of us spring came over with a different idea than the idea of those that come now.

Mr. Chairman, I do wish to present my friend, the distinguished North Carolinian. I might say I did not bring him up here because I did not know he was coming until I heard last night. He is a member of the State Senate of North Carolina and a very patriotic and distinguished citizen of my State. I take great pleasure in presenting him to you and commending him to you even as I have already commended you to him.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you, Senator. We are always glad to hear from Senator Smith. He and I agree on most things, and I won't be surprised if you might agree with me on this one.

Senator SMITH. You know what 1 man said in 1 of our hearings. He raised his hand when I tried to get him to agree we ought to work in peace and harmony on this thing. He clenched his fist and screamed out, "Never, never, never!"

Senator WATKINS. Identify yourself, giving your full name and place of residence.

**STATEMENT OF HUGH G. MITCHELL, SECOND VICE PRESIDENT,
AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES, STATESVILLE,
N. C.**

Mr. MITCHELL. Senator Watkins, I am here as second vice president of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. I live in Statesville, N. C.

Senator WATKINS. Whom do you represent?

Mr. MITCHELL. The American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

Mr. ARENS. How many societies are there?

Mr. MITCHELL. Ninety-four societies. I have a list of the organizations here which I will submit for the record.

(The list referred to follows:)

SOCIETIES COOPERATING WITH THE AMERICAN COALITION

Americanism Defense League
American Vigilant Intelligence Federation
American War Mothers
American Women's Legion of World Wars
Associated Chapters, Order of DeMolay of Pennsylvania
Associated Farmers of California, Inc.
Bill of Rights Commemorative Society
Colonial Order of the Acorn, New York Chapter
Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States
Dames of the Loyal Legion of Pennsylvania
Daughters of America, National Council
Daughters of America, District of Columbia Council
Daughters of the American Colonists, Angell Husted Chapter, Connecticut
Daughters of the American Colonists, Rhode Island
Daughters of the Revolution, National Society
Daughters of the Revolution, New Jersey Society
Daughters of the Revolution, New York Society
Daughters of the Revolution, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Daughters of the Revolution, Colonial Chapter
Daughters of the Revolution, Liberty Bell Chapter
Florida Committee for American Action
Fraternal Patriotic Americans, State of Pennsylvania, Inc.
General Society of the War of 1812
Junior Order United American Mechanics, New Jersey
Junior Order United American Mechanics, New York, Inc.
Junior Order United American Mechanics, Pennsylvania
Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic

Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of the Potomac
 Marine Corps League Auxiliary
 Marine Corps League, Cherry Point Detachment
 Marine Corps League, Department of North Carolina
 Marine Corps League, Southeastern Division
 Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery in Chief
 Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the
 District of Columbia
 Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the
 State of New York
 Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the
 State of Pennsylvania
 Military Order of the World Wars
 National Constitution Day Committee
 National Council for American Education
 National Society for Constitutional Security
 National Society for Constitutional Security, Chapter I
 National Society for Constitutional Security, Chapter II
 National Society for Constitutional Security, Chapter III
 National Society, Daughters of the Union, 1861-65
 National Society of New England Women
 National Society of New England Women, New York City Colony
 National Society of the Congress of State Societies
 National Society, Patriotic Women of America, Inc.
 National Society, Service Star Legion
 National Society, Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims
 National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, State of New York
 National Society, Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery
 Company
 National Sojourners
 National Women's Relief Corps
 Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, National Commandery
 Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, District of Columbia
 Commandery
 New Jersey Coalition, Inc.
 Ohio Coalition of Patriotic Societies
 Order of Colonial Lords of Manors in America
 Order of Independent Americans, Inc., State Council of Pennsylvania
 Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, California Society
 Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, District of Columbia Society
 Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Massachusetts Society
 Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, New Jersey Society
 Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, New York Society
 Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Rhode Island Society
 Order of the Three Crusades, 1096-1192, Inc.
 Patriotic Order Sons of America, National Camp
 Patriotic Order Sons of America, State Camp of Pennsylvania
 Rhode Island Association of Patriots
 Society of New York State Women
 Society of Old Plymouth Colony Descendants
 Society of the Sons of the Revolution in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
 Sons and Daughters of Liberty, National Council
 Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council Connecticut
 Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council District of Columbia
 Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council Massachusetts
 Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council New Hampshire
 Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council Pennsylvania
 Sons of the American Revolution, National Society
 Sons of the American Revolution, California Society
 Sons of the American Revolution, Empire State Society
 Sons of the American Revolution, Iowa Society
 Sons of the American Revolution, New Jersey Society
 Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War Commandery in Chief
 Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Massachusetts Department
 Southern Vigilant Intelligence Association, Inc.
 The American Tradition
 The Federation of Huguenot Societies in America

The Wheel of Progress

United States Flag Committee

Westchester Security League

Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor, United States of America

Women's National Defense Committee of Philadelphia

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, before presenting my statement I would like to read a resolution which was adopted by the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies in Washington, D. C., on the occasion of its annual convention January 29, 1953:

Whereas the American Coalition at its annual convention in Washington, D. C., January 24, 1952, voted its support for the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration and naturalization bill, urging Congress to enact this bill at the earliest possible moment; and

Whereas this bill became the law of the land by act of the last Congress in overriding the President's veto; and

Whereas a premature campaign has been organized to misinterpret this law in an improper and even false manner to the end that it be literally destroyed; and

Whereas there is incorporated in the Immigration and Naturalization Act appropriate procedures for amendments proved necessary in the light of practical experience: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urges Congress to give earnest and respectful consideration to the years of exhaustive and all-inclusive public hearings, and the efficient staff work designed to preserve and coordinate all the best features of all previous legislation in this field; and to resist radical and premature proposals advanced by pressure groups actuated by ulterior motives, including the same pressure groups that originally opposed the McCarran-Walter bill and favored instead the enactment of the Lehman-Humphrey bill.

Mr. Chairman, the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies is an organization, as I previously stated, composed of 94 patriotic and civic groups of this Nation which are banded together for the purpose of fostering, preserving, protecting, and advancing the best interests, ideals, and heritages of the United States. This organization recognizes the fact that in 1924 the Origins Act which resulted from years of exhaustive study on the part of representatives of the State Department, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Commerce, provides a means which did away with the charge of discrimination in the admission of nationals of various countries of the world. The purpose of the quota system ultimately was to abolish for all time the charges of discrimination and to give fair representation to the nations of the world whose nationals sought admission to this country.

The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 preserves that quota system and safeguards the United States against the charge of discrimination against any nation, race, or creed. The American Coalition believes that the passage of this bill, Senate bill 1917, would nullify the fundamental purposes for which the national-origins quota was adopted and would provide the means for a basis of the charge of discrimination so far as other nationals are concerned. We think that the 240,000 persons who would be admitted under the provisions of this bill would provide only a token gesture so far as relief to the world is concerned because from the established number of displaced persons, evacuees and expellees, that number of persons would represent only approximately one-fourth of 1 percent of such people existing in the world today. Obviously, that small number would not afford any appreciable relief to the areas concerned and would cer-

tainly bring about a situation in certain other nations of the world, as was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina a few moments ago, particularly in the Arabic world, and in the Far East, in which there are vast numbers of people who are underprivileged, who are expellees, who are suffering tremendous privation, and who of course desire the same privileges which these people of the countries concerned in this bill are seeking in asking for admission to these United States.

We think that with the large number of people in the displaced-persons camps, the evacuees, the expellees, and so forth, who might seek admission to this country under the provisions of this bill, that it would be an obviously impossible task to screen the backgrounds of each of these persons sufficiently to assure the representatives of our Government in administering such a bill that they are persons of the character and background who would make useful citizens. It is obvious of course by reason of the fact that they are expellees or evacuees that it would be impossible, particularly in those areas behind the Iron Curtain, to investigate their backgrounds to determine as to whether or not they are persons of Communist tendencies or if they are persons of other tendencies which would be inimicable to the welfare of these United States.

Thus it is the contention of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies that, without a proper screening of persons who would probably make up a large percentage of that category for which this bill is proposed, there will be a grave danger to the safety and welfare of this Nation in that a large number, we believe, of persons whose backgrounds would be of such character as to be inimicable to the welfare of the people of this Nation may be admitted.

In addition, we think that these 240,000 people if they were admitted into this Nation would create in our urban centers of population a problem which certain displaced persons created who were brought in under a previous administration. The density of population in the slum areas in our urban centers of population had been substantially reduced as a result of the Quota Act of 1924. The American Coalition thinks that this should serve to caution the Congress not to yield to sentimentality for aliens abroad, but continue to keep the welfare of the people of the United States first.

We feel that that problem has been brought to the front again by the increase of the density of the population of the slums in our big cities caused, we think, by bringing in large numbers of displaced persons, some 400,000 during the postwar period.

In addition, sir, we think that these people coming into the United States at this particular time will present another problem, if peace is attained, and it appears that peace is likely within the near future, of displacing many of the members of the Armed Forces of these United States from gainful employment when they return to resume their civilian status in this Nation.

As was mentioned a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, this, we believe, is a problem of overpopulation. We think that as to Europe, which has now a birthrate which causes an increase in population of some 3 million a year, that the United States is doing its part. Since 1820 the United States has admitted approximately 31 million people from Europe. Since that date the population of Europe has increased by 167 million people, not includ-

ing Russia. This overpopulation in Europe has increased the pressure for emigration to the United States. And we feel that this continued pressure due to overpopulation as well as to the other problems arising from World War II will not be settled by the passage of this bill or other bills which we believe would disrupt the economy and, yes, we believe would endanger the safety of our country.

These are days of great tension. These are days when people who believe in the fundamentals of good Americanism, people who have accepted the faith of our fathers, need to speak out and to be clear in their thinking in preserving, protecting, and safeguarding the American way of life. We believe that under the established quota system a sufficient number of properly screened citizens of the countries of the world may be determined and admitted to this country and that they will be of the caliber such as to make the right type of citizens for our country.

We find that in a study of crime in this Nation that a substantial percentage of the criminal element of our Nation originated from certain areas of Europe, some of which would be covered by this particular bill. We think that the question of screening the people who make application under the quota system to come into this Nation under the recent act of 1952 is the most thorough plan of admitting worthy people, nationals of other countries, into this Nation, thereby avoiding the great dangers which we have experienced in the past by an indiscriminate, we think, admission of displaced persons whose backgrounds have probably not been properly screened in many instances.

We think, Mr. Chairman, that in answering a question, if you will permit me, that you propounded to the Senator from North Carolina a few moments ago, as to "what we are going to do about these people who are displaced and who are wandering over the face of the earth, not only in Europe but in Asia, and other sections of the world, who have become evacuees or expellees for various reasons," that there are vast areas available now where people of the white race can live, can thrive, can prosper, which are under the control of other free governments of the world today, and if the United States is so disposed to expend funds or to lend funds to bring people from various areas of the world into these United States, why could we not ask the other free nations of the world that have such areas which are sparsely settled to permit these people to emigrate to those areas and to there be settled and to begin life again?

We think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a great challenge to our country in many ways, particularly in view of the fact that we have observed in the beginning and prior to the beginning of World War II that many of the nations that fell to the threat of totalitarianism were nations that had been impregnated by hordes of foreigners representing ideologies of government that were inimicable to the welfare of the people, of such nations, and certainly that lesson is one most outstanding and fresh in the minds of the people of these United States. And it behooves us, we believe, as a coalition of 94 of the Nation's oldest patriotic organizations to call attention to the imminence of this danger in hastily bringing into this country a large number of people whose backgrounds cannot be thoroughly established, many of whose ideologies of government so far as our established beliefs are concerned probably will be at variance with our way of life, with our form of

government, because in coming into this country and settling in the great urban centers of population, they can be the means of provoking internal unrest and trouble which could be a grave danger to our Nation in time of international conflict. For that reason, sir, we believe that this bill will be inimicable to the welfare of the people of these United States. We think that it should not pass. We think that the quota system established under the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952, which preserves the quota system of 1924, provides an orderly, sane, sound, and safe method for bringing in those nationals who seek admission to this country, thereby guaranteeing to our Nation a steady inflow, a controlled and restricted inflow of nationals of other countries whose backgrounds are deemed to be sufficient to justify their acceptance by our people as future citizens, people who can blend in and be a part of this great Nation of ours.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Lalos.

State your name, address, and occupation and profession, and if you represent an organization, please specify.

**STATEMENT OF ARTHUR H. LALOS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION,
SILVER SPRING, MD.**

Mr. LALOS. My name is Arthur H. Lalos, residing at 1907 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Md. My profession is administration of social and religious agencies, and I am now secretary of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, known also as the Order of Ahepa, a fraternal and social-service organization.

I appear before this committee to testify in favor of immigration bill S. 1917, introduced by Senator Watkins. The Order of Ahepa is in accord with the provisions of this bill and strongly urges its enactment into legislation.

We feel that this measure is consistent with American tradition of offering haven to the less fortunate and the tyrannically oppressed. Senate bill S. 1917 provides a timely measure of relief, and an opportunity for rehabilitation and firm settlement to thousands displaced by war, communistic oppression, and overpopulation pressures.

On behalf of the Order of Ahepa I express particular approval of the consideration accorded Greece by this immigration bill.

The Order of Ahepa in the past has functioned as a voluntary agency to assist in the administration of the amendment to the Displaced Persons Act insofar as it concerned Greece.

This experience placed officers and members of our organization face to face with acute problems created by the plight of more than 750,000 displaced persons in Greece and we therefore appreciate the dire need for legislative measures as represented by immigration bill S. 1917. The unfortunate condition of these people has been created primarily by the antidemocratic forces. Their rescue and rehabilitation is just as vital to peace and decency as the preservation of democracy itself. Their cause is the cause of all mankind and we protect our own safety and happiness when we promote theirs.

Knowing the character of the people who would come from Greece under the proposed emergency immigration bill S. 1917, we feel that we are serving America when we urge upon Congress the passage of

this humanitarian measure. We sincerely hope that it will receive the required support for its enactment into legislation real soon to afford the relief that is so greatly needed now.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very kindly for your presentation. Mr. Gregory.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD K. GREGORY, FOREST HILLS, N. Y.

Mr. GREGORY. Richard K. Gregory, 6804 Verne Street, Forest Hills, N. Y.

I speak on behalf of the Armenian Church in North America, the Union of Evangelical Churches in North America, and the Armenian Evangelical and Benevolent Union of America.

I thank you for the courtesy extended to me by taking me out of my turn.

The organizations for whom I speak, which are the three largest groups of organized Armenian-American citizens in the United States, are heartily in favor of this bill. It is a humanitarian bill and we believe that although it will not completely ameliorate the situation which exists, yet it is a step in the right direction.

However, we are constrained to bring to the attention of the chairman and the committee the justice which we seek. In other words, I speak, Mr. Chairman, for 300,000 escapees and displaced people, but their error has been that they have been displaced since the First World War. At the present time there are approximately 200,000 Armenians of ethnic origin in Syria. The Armenian people throughout the world are grateful to the Syrian Government for having afforded them a refuge, but it has been a refuge.

As president of the Armenian Evangelical and Benevolent Union of America, I am in a position to know through these many years that thousands of dollars collected in the United States have been sent to Syria and Lebanon to keep these people alive.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of Syria is doing whatever it can, but they are not allowed to become citizens, they cannot engage in full activity, and they have been displaced for 30 years.

The same situation exists in Lebanon, where there are approximately 100,000. The bill very generously allots 20,000 to Greece, but there, as a result of the massacres in Smyrna in 1923, the entire population escaped to Greece, and we have 12,000 Armenians who are people without a country. They are merely tolerated there, Mr. Chairman, and I speak on their behalf.

I respectfully recommend to the committee that something could be done and should be done on behalf of these people.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you.

Reverend Gibbons.

STATEMENT OF REV. WILLIAM J. GIBBONS, S. J., NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE ON SPECIAL IMMIGRATION

Reverend GIBBONS. The Reverend William J. Gibbons, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, member of the executive committee and information officer, New York City, 30 West 16th Street, New York 11.

The opportunity to express our views on special immigration legislation, now being considered by this subcommittee, is fully appreciated. We consider action on this matter to be important for the proper conduct of the Nation's foreign policy and for successful combating of communism.

The National Catholic Rural Life Conference has consistently favored effective action, including resettlement, on behalf of unabsorbed refugees, escapees, expellees, and other categories of displaced persons. At its 1952 convention in Saginaw, Mich., the board of directors included the following in the policy statement:

We urge enactment of special legislation to cover needs of refugees from communism and of migrants from certain areas of economic distress which can be assisted by limited migration.

As it appears to me, such action as is contemplated in S. 1917 is highly desirable for the following reasons:

- (1) To strengthen in their fight against communism member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;
- (2) To intensify the countereffort against propaganda issuing from the Kremlin;
- (3) To assist in resettling refugees and others politically and economically displaced within the Western European defense area;
- (4) To open additional opportunities for securing some needed manpower;
- (5) To provide leadership in finding solutions posed by unsettled conditions in Europe, especially as these relate to displacement of people.

I would like to comment briefly on these points.

(1) Communist-inspired efforts to prevent, delay, or obstruct in every way possible the eventuation of an integrated Western European community are so evident as to need no stressing. From the viewpoint of the Kremlin, it is very important that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member states be kept from developing into an effective organ capable of countering aggression. Communist effort, helped along at times by the lack of perception among other groups, is directed toward keeping the constituent elements of NATO constantly off balance, that is, economically weak, psychologically confused, politically unstable.

Naturally, we Americans are seriously disturbed by what we see in Europe and by Communist success in fostering disorder and anxiety, even without firing a shot. Were a single remedy capable of bringing strength out of Europe's weakness, certainly no reasonable effort on our part should be left undone in order to apply that remedy. Unfortunately, this is not possible. Maneuverings by the Kremlin are such that a variety of steps must be taken both simultaneously and successively, in order to counter the Communist efforts and to remedy, so far as possible, the conditions on which communism feeds. One such step is to promote permanent resettlement of individuals and families who cannot now be absorbed into the countries where they presently find themselves.

I am not recommending this as a panacea, nor am I saying that the United States can of itself resolve the problem that results from serious displacement of peoples in Western Europe. It is manifestly impossible for this country to resettle or even accept full responsibility for resettling all the persons in the world who are today displaced for

one reason or another. But we can do something in each region according to the circumstances and the needs. The effort contemplated in S. 1917 is directed toward one very important regional grouping, the NATO nations and the key areas for Western European defense. I do not believe we should be distracted from that region in this particular matter, by introducing extraneous considerations which may be both irrelevant and confusing. It is manifestly impossible to speak intelligently of problems of resettlement and migration and I might add of population on a completely global basis, apart from concrete situations.

The United States, while doing what it can to foster activity by intergovernmental and other national bodies, can contribute to the strengthening of the NATO countries of Greece, Italy, and the Netherlands, by admitting limited numbers of their nationals who are presently affected by serious displacement.

To be specific, the Netherlands, in surrendering its overseas territories, has been faced with a special displacement problem which affects the whole economy. The situation has been aggravated within the year by storms which flooded large areas of farmland and contributed to distress and unemployment. No doubt the courageous Dutch will in time find answers to their problems, as they have in the past by capturing farmland from the North Sea. But in the present they are hindered in their noteworthy efforts to promote wider European community and international cooperation in the battle against communism. It is a safe guess that the Kremlin would like to see them weakened still further to the point of ineffectiveness.

Italy's position is also one of curtailed overseas areas for settlement and income. It has, moreover, received back numerous former colonists not a few of whom are still on relief. It has within its borders displaced persons from neighboring countries. It, too, within a matter of months had a very destructive flood in its rich farming area of the Po Valley.

As for Greece, the effects of civil war, of displacement from wartime and postwar events along the Greek borders, of a temporarily overburdened economy, are very real indeed. Greece is making progress and through our efforts has been successful in forestalling Communist aggression. It, like Italy and the Netherlands, is a member of NATO. While providing monetary aid, we should not overlook the genuine economic assistance that can be rendered by helping resettle the displaced in these areas.

(2) To those who follow refugee and population questions closely, it is no secret that creating confusion in these matters is a choice weapon of the Communists. The real issues are bypassed in order to concentrate on details of less consequence or to create impressions hostile to the United States and its policies. One of the real issues we can do something about is that of displaced people in key defense regions of Western Europe and the NATO countries especially.

It is clearly a great burden on the West German and the Austrian economies, both key areas in Communist European strategy, to provide even minimum care for refugees, unabsorbed expellees, escapees, and residual displaced persons within their borders.

I might add that I have had opportunity of viewing the German situation within the past 2 years at firsthand.

For geographic and other reasons, these are the areas into which the escapees come in substantial numbers. The vast majority of the earlier refugees as yet unresettled are to be found there. The problems created by the condition of these people provide a continuing source of propaganda to Communist, and to other groups which consciously or unconsciously play into the hands of Communists. In the case of more recent refugees, escapees, and still unresettled expellees, it works to Communist advantage to have them unemployed and distressed in these key regions of Western Europe.

As regards Italy, the situation is currently in focus in the news coming to us. The Communists take full advantage of the economic distress of returnees, refugees, displaced population generally. To appreciate the situation, the geography and recent history must be taken into account. I would like to make some things clear. Italy's problems of underemployment and economic displacement are by no means the outcome solely or even primarily of current rates of population growth.

In that connection I would like to state for the record that the birth-rate in Italy is below our own. It is clearly becoming evident that Italy is following the pattern of Ireland in delayed marriages and decreasing the size of the families. There are a lot of mistaken ideas in the minds of some that should be clarified. The problem facing the Netherlands with the loss of its colonies in the Far East, with Italy with its loss of colonies in Africa, and Germany and Austria are in a key spot to receive the escapees, they cannot help that. It is the geography. These are simple facts of political realities of the European situation we cannot ignore. The situation in Italy is not all the result of inefficiency, inaction, and timidity as some would have us believe. On the contrary, they are the logical outcome of several decades of fascism, and of war and devastation, as well as loss of former overseas territories, influx of refugees, and continuing Communist agitation. Italy could conceivably do better, but if all had done as well there would be fewer nations behind the Iron Curtain. I submit that it is a dangerous kind of prejudice to ignore certain of Italy's problems and thus provide additional propaganda to the Communists.

As regards the recent refugees and escapees, it is an effective counter-measure against Communist propaganda to provide opportunity for a reasonable percentage of them to come to our shores. Some of the best analysis of Communist aims, methods, and strategy have come from persons originally residing within the U. S. S. R. or in lands taken over by the Kremlin rulers. Provided these individuals are properly screened, and we should admit no escapees or refugees who do not qualify on these grounds, there is no reason why we should not admit them. Our assistance in resettling them is in itself a counterpropaganda tactic that upsets the Communist leadership.

I would like to add this point, in the course of the past week, I have had the most refreshing experience of my life in reading an account of a former great Russian refugee, George Federof, in which he discusses some of the problems of the Russian Empire. We all know that aggressions in different directions create constant problems in the area of ethnic groupings. We ought to study it. With the insight that comes from some of the refugees that come from behind

the Iron Curtain we would know a lot more than we do at present. As I listen to our critics of our efforts to carry the Voice of America behind the Iron Curtain and to do something to aid those who escape through it, I wonder if they know all about communism and how it operates.

(3) There is a humanitarian aspect of resettlement which cannot be overlooked by us if we are to merit the position of leadership which has come our way. Because we believe so intensely in the dignity of the human personality, we are unwilling to permit forced repatriation in Korea, we helped displaced persons after the war, we urge adjustment between nations which have mutual refugees on their doorsteps. It is fully in line with these principles to provide aid to persons displaced in Europe who have no home to go to, and who are a serious burden on the countries in which they reside.

(4) This country can utilize additional workers in certain categories especially. The farm-labor situation remains tight in a number of regions. Certain specialized skills are in short supply. In any case, because of the age-structure of our own population, we are short on young workers in certain age groups—I am thinking of the college ages and thereabouts—and will be more in need should military requirements increase for one reason or other. It is not unwise to have some additional source of manpower open to our employers during the next few years. I myself believe they will be crucial years in the struggle for leadership, in countering Communism.

(5) I trust that the intergovernmental efforts to resettle displaced Europeans will continue and improve, and that the United States will encourage them. There are a number of countries of predominantly European ancestry which could absorb thousands of these migrants, and with advantage to themselves in terms of skills, new blood, fresh ideas.

With so many crises confronting the free nations, there is danger that the importance of orderly migration will receive less attention than it deserves. For that reason the United States, as it did in the case of postwar resettlement of displaced persons, should assume leadership in providing resettlement opportunities for a percentage of the prospective migrants.

In conclusion, I would like to repeat our support for the objectives of S. 1917, and our belief in the need for special assistance to refugees, escapees, and certain groups of economically distressed persons, including returnees from former colonies. Because we can not do everything, and cannot solve all the world's problems of distressed and displaced people, is no reason for not doing something, and especially for a region as vitally important as Western Europe. The member nations of NATO, and Germany and Austria, merit our special attention. The Kremlin is certainly not neglecting them.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you, Reverend Gibbons.

Mr. ARENS. I would like to ask him 1 or 2 questions.

Senator WATKINS. At this point I am going to yield to our chief of staff, Mr. Arens, to go on with the hearing for a short time. I am required to leave. All the other members of the committee are tied up. We have one in Los Angeles, we have others conducting other hearings. It is almost impossible to get full attendance.

I want to assure those who are to present their views that they are entered in the printed record and that record becomes available

to all the Senators. That is the only way we can do it. Eventually that is what will happen to this record.

Thank you very much on behalf of the committee for coming.

Mr. ARENS has some questions and he will call the next witness.

Mr. ARENS. Reverend Gibbons, for the sake of personal enlightenment for the moment and to clarify the record, will you tell me what the National Catholic Rural Life Conference is in relation to the National Catholic Welfare Conference? Through the years I have known and worked through Bruce Mohler in the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Reverend GIBBONS. It is a national organization founded in 1923 by the present bishop of Kansas City, Bishop Edward V. O'Hara, and a number of western priests, laity, and bishops on the board of directors, both clergy and laity men and women. We, of course, report annually to the National Catholic Welfare Conference Board of Bishops, but we do not report to the secretariat. It is a semiautonomous group, reporting to the bishops in our field of welfare, agriculture, and the like, and so far as these bear on religious and moral issues. We do not conduct a farm organization as such. We try to maintain, so far as possible, a neutral position with the various farm organizations of this country and maintain friendly relations abroad.

Mr. ARENS. The thing I would like to ask is this: In immigration work, in working say on displaced-persons legislation, on this and on the omnibus immigration bill, and so forth, our contacts with the Catholic Church as such as an entity have been basically through the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Bruce Mohler, Gene Buckner, are they the immigration spokesmen for the Catholic Church as such or is there any spokesman?

Reverend GIBBONS. It is very hard to say that one is final spokesman.

Mr. ARENS. Is their primary interest immigration or yours?

Reverend GIBBONS. Their primary interest is immigration. Our primary interest is economic development and rural welfare. As you may know, we have conducted several international conferences in that area. We have recently visited Latin America and worked there investigating, among other things, the desirability of some of these countries receiving these migrants from Europe, knowing they could use them much better, perhaps, than some of the other countries of the world.

Mr. ARENS. What is the relationship, if I am not trying your patience here, what is the relationship of Monsignor Swanstrom's organization to your organization and to NCWC?

Reverend GIBBONS. His organization is also semiautonomous. It reports to the administering board of bishops. It is the overseas relief arm of the NCWC, with its own director and its own staff operating out of New York, and with offices in the various countries where aid is being given by American overseas organizations.

Mr. ARENS. Are you the director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference?

Reverend GIBBONS. I am information officer and member of the board of executive committee. The executive director is Monsignor Ligutti, who is in Des Moines and unable to be here at this time.

The president is Bishop Hayes, of Davenport, Iowa.

Mr. ARENS. I am not sure I gathered all you told us about the interplay of these organizations, but I am glad to have the record straight on it. Have you had occasion to acquaint yourself with S. 1766, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Utah on April 25, to create or establish the Office of Commissioner of Refugees? Are you acquainted with that bill?

Reverend GIBBONS. Only with the substance, not with the text. I have not studied it, I must admit. The idea, however, as far as I understand it, is to coordinate the various affairs relating to refugee operations of our Government.

Mr. ARENS. All within one agency.

Reverend GIBBONS. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. We thank you very much.

We have a distinguished gentleman who just arrived, Senator Ferguson. The committee members have one by one absented themselves from the hearing. In view of the fact that we have a previously committed schedule—the chairman just left a few minutes ago—the chairman asked me if I might sit here and act as moderator and chairman on his behalf to make the record. I assume the senior Senator from Michigan wanted to comment on the bill.

Senator FERGUSON. I did, but I will be glad to wait if you want me to, and come back later.

Mr. ARENS. No; I will say this, I am sure that the Senators on the committee would be delighted to have you make your record in view of the heavy commitments they have. There is an Internal Security Subcommittee hearing running on right now.

STATEMENT OF HON. HOMER FERGUSON, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Senator FERGUSON. I am very glad to make a statement on the bill, of which I am a cosponsor. The Senator from Michigan introduced a similar bill very shortly after the President made his statement in relation to the fact that legislation was needed for people who had been forced to leave their respective countries and also legislation was needed in certain cases because of surplus population. Having been a sponsor of the original displaced-persons bill, and having visited the camps in Europe, I believe that some relief should be had. I felt that because of the pressures—and I will cite Italy as one of the countries where the pressure of population is really enormous—that we could well lead the way in showing the other countries of the world that we are interested in this question of immigration.

We were colonized originally, and the United States was one of the original places where people could come if they were forced to leave their respective crowded conditions for any cause whatever it may be. In some cases it was religion and in some cases it was the desire for a different kind of government, a different kind of liberty, and a different kind of justice. If we could hold open to these people who are forced to come from behind the Iron Curtain a haven, I am satisfied in my own mind that we will find fine, progressive citizens among them.

I am not unmindful of the fact that there may be agents, espionage agents, who are sent out of these countries who would want to come into this country and into the other free countries of the world, but in

the bill that I introduced and in the bill now under consideration there is no attempt to take down the barriers or no attempt to make it possible that agents of Soviet Russia or her satellites would be allowed to come in. In other words, we want to use the immigration laws as a screening power to get good people, as other nations are wanting to do. None of these nations are asking us to accept people who will not make good citizens in their respective countries. The great majority of these escapees are people forced out, and if a few agents should be sent out, then it is up to us in our respective countries to try to ascertain who they are and not allow them to carry on espionage or other illegal acts.

We had recently an example of a man who left Poland, Lt. Frank Jarecki, who flew his plane to Denmark, and then came over here on a visit. I have seen him twice in Washington. I introduced a bill that his stay may be made permanent here. I believe personally that he has the qualifications that will make a good citizen.

Now, since he has come, another has flown a jet Mig from Poland. I think this illustrates what is happening, and what can happen, if we hold out some hope to these escapees.

I think we cannot be unmindful of the fact that people are fleeing the Iron Curtain to come to the free world. I find no evidence that people are breaking the curtain the other way. In other words, they do not flee the free world and break into the Iron Curtain.

I must come to the conclusion that participation in what America stands for must be held open for a certain number of these people. If any fact is needed to convince people that we have a better place in which to live, that the free world is better than the Iron Curtain, I think it is demonstrated when this flyer left Poland and flew out of his squadron, took the chance of being shot down, to get to freedom.

We must not be unmindful of those people who perform daring deeds to seek freedom and liberty.

Now, if we are going to return these people, then we are not going to encourage them to seek freedom, and we are going to let freedom die in other nations. They tell me that a proof of this is that Poland today, back of the Iron Curtain, is telling the people there that this pilot was returned, that he is now in prison in Poland so that their people will feel that there is no reason to flee the Iron Curtain.

I can see why they would say that. But I assure you that I saw him in the Senate dining room just yesterday and he has not been returned to Poland. He is not standing trial, and he has sought freedom.

I only cite that as an example of the reason that I believe we must hold out hope. Now, there are going to be people, and my mail indicates it, who object to this. They are fearful that some espionage agents will come in. I want to say now in this open hearing that I believe we should do the best we can to keep those agents out, but we cannot destroy the hope of those behind the Iron Curtain because of the fact that one agent may get in. We can get the same kind of person under our regular immigration laws and, therefore, I think that this bill is essential. I hope the committee will see that it gets onto the floor at a very early date.

I have no pride of authorship in the bill that I introduced. I left it a rather broad bill because I felt this was one of the places where the President, through Executive order, could determine where these

people were to come from, and how they were to come in, subject to the immigration laws. In other words, I wanted to try to reduce the redtape as much as possible to see that something was done immediately.

We may be surprised when we do something for these people, as to the number of people who will leave the Iron Curtain, yes; and even fly Migs or bombers out of these countries to land in a safe haven, such as Europe and America.

Now I do not believe that Europe can absorb all these people, and I think it is a little unfair for us in the free world to expect that. Other nations—and I cite Canada and South America, Central America, New Zealand, and Australia—should join us to show that we do not expect Europe to absorb these refugees. We want to treat the free world as a haven for freedom. If we can reestablish freedom in the world and behind the Iron Curtain, then we can expect that some of these people would like to return and again become citizens of their lands which they had to leave because of tyranny.

Let us hope that we can make a world in which people will not have to flee their respective countries and become escapees.

I think that is all unless you have some questions.

Mr. ARENS. Senator, are you familiar with the bill, S. 1766?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. That is the bill to create the Office of Commissioner of Refugees, it is not a migration bill. It is a companion bill.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Would you care to express yourself on that bill?

Senator FERGUSON. I just want to say that I think such a bill is essential to get a commissioner who can do this particular job and do it more quickly and with less redtape than is demanded by the usual procedure.

Mr. ARENS. I am sure the Senators on the committee will welcome the Senator's statement for the record.

I am sure also that the Senators on both the Immigration Subcommittee and on the Judiciary Committee are exceedingly regretful that the Senator is no longer a member of the Judiciary Committee and is not in a position to actively serve as he has done so admirably in the past on so many important matters that were connected with the Judiciary Committee.

Senator FERGUSON. I regret that I had to leave the Judiciary Committee where this work is done, but I left there and went to the Foreign Relations Committee and that Foreign Relations Committee, of course, is interested in exactly this same problem.

Mr. ARENS. Would the Senator care to express himself, if he knows, about the hearings which are in the offing by the Foreign Relations Committee with respect to the Palestine Arabs?

Senator FERGUSON. The only thing I can say is that the bill has been referred to the Subcommittee of the Near East of which Senator Taft of Ohio, the majority leader, is the chairman. Unfortunately, the Senator is ill at the present time or I know he would be glad to come in and explain their work. I do not happen to be a member of that particular subcommittee, but I am interested in that problem. They are going into this matter and will be able to report on it. From time to time when I have been in that theater I have been in some of the refugee camps. I know something of the problem, and I

know that the proper committee is looking into it. It was taken up in the regular meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you very much, Senator. I am sure you will be most welcome if you care to remain here while we receive the testimony of some other folks who have come to testify with reference to this matter.

Senator FERGUSON. I would like to be excused. I have some other important matters. That is why I was a little late. I would appreciate it if you can excuse me. I expect to read the record on this matter.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kaarel R. Pusta. He is next.

Mr. Pusta, will you kindly identify yourself by name and residence, as well as by organization which you represent.

STATEMENT OF KAAREL R. PUSTA, SR., CHAIRMAN, ESTONIAN AID, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. PUSTA. My name is Kaarel R. Pusta, chairman of Estonian Aid, Inc., located in New York.

Mr. ARENS. Do you care to have a seat, Mr. Pusta? Make yourself comfortable while you testify.

Mr. PUSTA. Thank you.

On May 18, 1953, the following letter was addressed by Estonian Aid, Inc. to the President of the United States:

To continue American leadership and participation in the solution of the surplus population problems in Europe, you made a pronouncement on April 22, calling for the admission into the United States of 240,000 people from Western Europe over and above the alien quota during the next 2 years.

The Estonians have hailed this declaration so much the more as you kindly called the attention of the legislature on the case of Estonia whose annual quota, extremely limited by itself, had been charged for 50 percent in advance under the requirements of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, and thus virtually mortgaged through the year 2148.

Of the 400,000 persons admitted into the United States under the DP Act, only 11,117 Estonian refugees have been resettled in this country. Their occupational analysis, high educational attainments and devotion to democracy, their cultural, social, and other contributions have already shown that they represent a valuable resource for the economy, culture, and security of the United States.

However, there are over 30,000 Estonian refugees still in Western Europe who have no way back to their homeland, which is occupied by Russia. They cannot be definitely settled in Western Germany, which country has its own problems arising from the presence of some 10,000,000 refugees, expellees, and escapees, with a great number of unemployed people. The available data show that out of 4,000 Estonian refugees left in Germany at the expiration of the DP Act, at least 2,300 need the support of the Estonian relief organizations in the United States and Canada.

In the United Kingdom the 5,000 Estonian refugees are considered as temporary settlers and restricted to certain occupations. They are practically without prospects for an integration in the British community. The same is true of France, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Switzerland, and Austria.

On the other side, there have been thousands of Estonians who fled to Sweden and Germany in the last hour before the Russian invasion in 1944 or left later the displaced persons camps in Germany for Australia, Argentina, Brazil, South Africa, and New Zealand, just before the expiration of the DP Act. Very often, women and children were embarked on small boats sailing to Sweden, in order to save

them from the onslaught of the Communist invaders, while the men took the chance of following the retreating German Army. There were also spouses, sons and daughters, who were cleared first by the immigration agencies and took the first transport to America, in the hope that their near relatives would rejoin them later.

Furthermore, a large number of families were broken up, when those who remained in the DP camps came to the United States under the DP Act, while the refugees who went to England and other countries on temporary employment were declared ineligible, even though they included spouses, parents, and children of those who were already in this country. We, therefore, respectfully submit that the new legislation authorize admission of refugees from any country of their present residence, if under the previous resettlement programs one or more members of their families have already been admitted into the United States.

The borders of Estonia are most severely watched over by the Russians in order to prevent the people from escaping abroad. Consequently, there are very few Estonians who may be included strictly speaking into the category of "escapees." As refugees from a foreign Communist regime, which was forced upon Estonia first in June 1940, and overtook again the country in September 1944, the Estonians could be helped by a special immigration act only if the date of eligibility is adapted to their case.

May it be further suggested that refugees residing now in the United States be given an opportunity to remain in this country, by including in the emergency legislation a paragraph similar to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948?

The purpose of the memorandum to the President, which was submitted without acquaintance with Senator Watkins' bill S. 1917, was to express the acknowledgement of the Estonian group in this country of the Presidential message to Congress and to remember the situation of Estonian refugees, which was only partly settled by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The fact that causes most vexation to the Estonians is the separation of families as it resulted from the conditions of a hasty migration before and under the DP Act. This separation is felt very strongly by our people who have lost everything but the hope to assemble the members of their families which fled annihilation by the Russians and are now dispersed in several countries of the free world. Hence, every emergency legislation causes a new hopeful expectation, and our memorandum emphasizes the belief that the members of divided families, if otherwise eligible, should have facilities to rejoin one another.

Being aware that the present bill, while concerned especially with the surplus population of certain European countries, does not provide for admission into the United States from any other country of temporary residence, we submit, therefore, that at least the number of 15,000 allotted under section 4 (2) be augmented and Sweden and Switzerland be included in the areas mentioned in the paragraph (2).

We understand that the excellent definition of the term "escapee" as offered in the section 2 (a) of the bill covers also the displaced persons and refugees who have not been finally resettled in the country of their present residence.

We again respectfully suggest that refugees who are already residing in the United States be given an opportunity to remain in this country, by including in the present bill a paragraph similar to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. With regard to the Estonians such a disposition would regulate the status of some hundreds of individuals.

According to our schedule, the next witness is Mr. Finucane, of the National Council for the Prevention of War.

STATEMENT OF JAMES FINUCANE, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF WAR, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. ARENS. Will you kindly identify yourself by name, residence, and the organization which you represent?

Mr. FINUCANE. My name is James Finucane. I am associate secretary of the National Council for Prevention of War, with its office at 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

I would like to address myself to three main points. First of all, I would like to mention in summary detail the conditions which still prevail in Western Germany with the expellees. It is not necessary to go back to 1944 and 1945, and to describe the scenes on the road where expellees with packs on their backs and on foot traveled hundreds of miles, sometimes with families, large families, with them. I talked to a woman in Berlin that told me that she had walked, I think she said 400 miles, from East Prussia to Berlin, pushing two infants in a baby carriage in front of her. A friend of hers told me that she had been assaulted a number of times by the Russian soldiers en route.

It is not necessary to go into the housing situation which these expellees found when they arrived in Germany, with what was left in Germany, with 20 percent of the houses destroyed and only 80 percent left. It is not necessary to point out what difficulty in making a living these people encountered in a Germany which was in process of being de-industrialized under the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement. It is not necessary to dwell on social de-classification, the proletarianization, that occurred among these millions of people as they tried to settle themselves in a country which had no room for them.

In 1951 when the temper of the expellees was still at a moderate level, I attended a national convention of expellees from Pomerania, in Kiel. There were thousands of persons there, thousands of them zealously interested in their own future, in the fate of the areas they had left, and in the possibility, some time, of returning to those areas. Many of the speeches were given in a passionate tone. The expellees have been greatly sinned against and they are now, I would say, for the 20th century, God's angry man. They are suffering from homesickness. Just as in this country when you go to Atlantic City you can buy souvenirs of Atlantic City or when you come to Washington you can buy souvenirs of Washington, in Western Germany you can buy souvenirs of all the places behind the Iron Curtain. You can buy porcelain medallions, photographs, you can buy picturebooks and novels originating in those areas. I have, for example, a document which arrived in the mail this week. It is the yearbook of Albertus University in Koenigsberg which has now been annexed by the Rus-

sians, and from which the German population was driven. The people coming from Koenigsberg keep alive, in western Germany the culture of and interest in those areas which they left. This is a homesickness that must be some way or other assuaged or, to some degree dealt with.

You might ask why should we worry about this in particular. In the memorandum which I have handed to you, I give some of the documentary evidence showing our responsibility as a nation for the expulsions of these 9 or 10 million expellees.

Mr. ARENS. Do you propose to have those inserted in the record?

Mr. FINUCANE. If you please.

Mr. ARENS. May I suggest that as you come to the documents that you want to discuss, you tell the reporter and they will be inserted into the record.

Mr. FINUCANE. Mr. Reporter, this document that I have handed to you contains 2 documents, 1 a letter from President Roosevelt and 1 an extract from a speech by Prime Minister Churchill, indicating the joint responsibility of the Americans and British, with the Russians, for the expulsion of some 9 million expellees.

Mr. ARENS. They will then be inserted, if you please, at this point in the record, in toto.

(The documents referred to follows:)

TESTIMONY OF JAMES FINUCANE, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR

LET'S WELCOME OUR CONSCIENCE QUOTA

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we want to support this bill with some reservations and amendments. To the extent that it deals with the expellees and escapees it can be a first step toward recognition of the duty we have to take care of the 9 million people whom we, as a nation, have made homeless.

First I would like to demonstrate our historic responsibility for the expellees.

Attempts are often made to excuse America from responsibility for the expulsions. One committee of the other House, in a report after the war, said, in effect: "The United States only agreed to an evil which was already in process, which could not be prevented. We managed to add a stipulation that they be carried out in a humane manner."

However, further research since the date of that congressional report pins the blame squarely on England and on the United States along with Russia.

The fruits of this research have been assembled by a French scholar, Alfred Grosser, and were published in January of this year. The publication is called *L'Allemagne de l'Occident, 1945-53*. The publisher is Gallimard in Paris.

Poland was, by Allied agreement in 1944, to be compensated in the West for territory she would yield to Russia in the East. This understanding envisaged the transfer of all non-Polish populations from the new area which was of course to be taken away from Germany. These persons to be deported would have no place to go except within what would be left of Germany.

In the final months of 1944 discussions on this subject took place between the Polish Exile Government in London and the British and American Governments. Two confidential letters resulted from the conference.

The first of the two letters was written November 2, 1944, by the British Foreign Office in the name of the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill. It accepted the line of the Oder River, including Stettin, without specifying in detail the southern part. It offered the support and guaranty of Great Britain to Poland for this boundary, even in case of an unfavorable attitude on the part of the United States.

The second letter was dated November 17, 1944, and was signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States. In this letter, President Roosevelt said he would agree to any boundary approved by Poland, Russia, and Great Britain. He would not raise any objections to a transfer of population and even offered to assist in the expulsions.

The highlights of this letter are contained in annex A.

On December 15, 1944, Churchill spoke to the House of Commons about the advantages Poland would obtain in the West from the German territories far richer than those she was to abandon in the East.

Churchill's painfully clear foresight of the expulsion deed and his admission of complicity are clearly contained in this speech. See annex B.

At Yalta, Churchill repeated, "the 6 or 7 million Germans killed in the war plus a million more dead that are to be expected to die before the surrender will leave plenty of space in Germany for the deported populations."

It must be said in Mr. Churchill's behalf that he advocated the drawing of the southern part of the new border along the eastern Neisse River while the Russians wanted to draw it along the western Neisse River. This made a potential difference of more than 4 million German citizens to become liable to deportation.

However, the Neisse part of the border was never agreed upon and the Americans learned at Potsdam that by an agreement signed April 21, 1945, the Soviet Union had given to Poland for purposes of administration—and expulsion all the territory up to the Oder-western Neisse line.

By the time of Potsdam, Roosevelt was dead, and in the months thereafter both President Truman and Prime Minister Churchill tried to get out from under responsibility for the expulsions. But in view of the record it seems clear that they had established the principles of expulsion as desirable. After that it must have seemed peculiar to the Russians that they would seem to quibble over 1 or 2 million expellees more or less.

This bill, including 110,000 special immigration visas for expellees and escapees, will, if only in token fashion, undo a small fraction of this great evil. Let's welcome our conscience quota.

ANNEX A TO TESTIMONY OF JAMES FINUCANE

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE TO MR. MIKOLAJCZYK

The following is the text of a message addressed by President F. D. Roosevelt to Mr. Mikolajczyk, who was at that time Prime Minister of the London Polish Government. This message, signed on November 17, 1944, in part 3 deals with the question of the transfer of population.

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER:

NOVEMBER 17, 1944.

* * * * *

3. If the Polish Government and people desire in connection with the new frontiers of the Polish state to bring about the transfer to and from territory of Poland of national minorities, the United States Government will raise no objection and as far as practicable will facilitate such transfer.

* * * * *

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

ANNEX B TO TESTIMONY OF JAMES FINUCANE

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH MADE BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE WINSTON CHURCHILL, PRIME MINISTER OF HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT

Mr. Churchill, as Prime Minister of the British Cabinet, in a speech to the House of Commons on December 15, 1944, dealt in detail with the transfer of the German population from Poland.

The relevant extract is given below:

"The transference of several millions of people would have to be effective from the east to the west or north, and the expulsion of the Germans (because that is what is proposed—the total expulsion of the Germans) from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and north. For expulsion is the method which, so far as we have been able to see, will be the most satisfactory and last-

ing. There will be no mixture of populations to cause endless trouble as in Alsace-Lorraine. A clean sweep will be made. I am not alarmed at the prospect of the disentanglement of populations, nor am I alarmed by these large transferences, which are more possible than they ever were before through modern conditions * * *

Mr. FINUCANE. Those are my first two points, that the situation is bad and that we bear a responsibility for it.

My third point deals with the specific provisions of S. 1917. We would propose that the references to the escapees and expellees, and the inclusion of them within a single number of 110,000 be altered. We would propose that these definitions be added to and clarified, and that instead of there being a pool of 110,000 quota numbers, that it be divided among 3 types of refugees: 1 type of expellee and 2 types of escapees. Otherwise, if this number is left as a pool, Congress will be buying a pig in a poke.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have specific language to suggest to meet the idea that you have there of breaking this escapee category into sub-categories?

Mr. FINUCANE. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not have specific language which could be used for a draft, but I can outline what it should be.

Mr. ARENS. If you can do that, I think it would be helpful to the committee.

Mr. FINUCANE. First of all, I would like to give the basis of this division. According to the calculations which are available to us, the number of escapees and expellees in Germany bear somewhat the following relationship to each other in numbers. Of all the persons who are refugees in Germany, one-fifteenth are non-German escapees, three-fifteenths are German escapees, and eleven-fifteenths are expellees.

Mr. ARENS. What are your statistics on the non-German refugees in Germany?

Mr. FINUCANE. The non-German refugees we estimate to be approximately 300,000.

Mr. ARENS. Our estimate is 200,000.

Mr. FINUCANE. There is a certain element of doubt in our statistics. There is a calculation allowed in there for a possible increase from an earlier number, which was lower, to allow for unreported German escapees who have been coming across the border, in recent weeks.

Mr. ARENS. What is your estimate of the number of German escapees in Germany?

Mr. FINUCANE. The German escapees in Germany we estimate to be approximately 2 million.

Mr. ARENS. Our estimate is 1,600,000 now.

Mr. FINUCANE. If you would be interested in the source of this last figure—

Mr. ARENS. Yes; we would.

Mr. FINUCANE. It is from a statement made by Dr. Frederick Edding, of Kiel, of the Kiel Institute for World Economy in Germany. He made this statement at a convention of European population experts in Paris, May 21-23, 1953.

Mr. ARENS. What is your estimate of the number of expellees in Germany?

Mr. FINUCANE. The number of expellees, and basing it on his figure, again, which is confirmed by other sources available to us, is 8,300,000.

Mr. ARENS. Our estimate is 8 million.

Mr. FINUCANE. He, incidentally perhaps explains by indicating the flow over the recent 3 years and the past 3 months. He gives for 1950, 243,000; for 1951, 210,000; for 1952, about 160,000; and for the first 4 months of 1953 he gives 119,000.

Mr. ARENS. What are your estimates on Austria, then, your non-German refugees in Austria?

Mr. FINUCANE. Forty thousand was the last figure we had on that. It was 1951, and the source was the High Commissioner of Austria.

Mr. ARENS. Ours is 46,000 and 58,000. It is a very fluid estimate. What is your estimate, if you please, on your Volksdeutsch in Austria?

Mr. FINUCANE. Volksdeutsch and Reichsdeutsch together are about 200,000 in Austria.

Mr. ARENS. That is about what we have.

Mr. FINUCANE. We feel these people should be separated in the language of the bill.

Mr. ARENS. Wait just a minute, if you please, so I can get clear. Which groups do you think should be separated? Do you think that the Potsdam expelles should be separated from the non-Potsdam German refugees; is that correct?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes. I will tell you the way we thought this out, Mr. Chairman. It was in line with the language of this bill up to a certain extent. That is, in this draft we have taken the term "German expellee" and agreed with its exclusion from that term of the persons who came into Western Germany from Eastern Germany. We agree that it is perhaps all right to include them under the term "escapee," but that the term "escapee" should be split into two separate types. There should be German escapees and non-German escapees. Then the ratio of quota numbers should be determined on that basis which I mentioned before, one-fifteenth for the non-German escapees, three-fifteenths for the German escapees, and eleven-fifteenths for the expellees. This ratio that I gave you does not relate directly to the total number of these refugees, the global numbers that we have talked about, but in conformance with the definition of both expellee and escapee in this bill, it relates only to that portion of the refugees who are not firmly settled.

Mr. ARENS. Somehow I do not have that. The record may have it, but I do not have it.

Mr. FINUCANE. Let me do it over again. In rough terms I will give you the raw numbers and you can draw your own conclusions.

Mr. ARENS. Let's start with the definition of escapee as appearing in S. 1917. What is it you do not like about that definition? It ought to be split into two categories?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes. I will tell you why. Because it includes a number of persons, perhaps 140,000, who were eligible for migration under the Displaced Persons Act. Those persons have had a chance to migrate. The other group, which is much larger, is roughly, in raw numbers seven times larger. These non-German escapees have not had the opportunities to migrate—the German escapees have not had the opportunity to migrate equivalent to that the non-German escapees have had. This would rectify that condition.

Mr. ARENS. I do not mean to be contentious with you. Why didn't they? In the Displaced Persons Act it provided that fifty-four-thousand-seven-hundred-odd quota numbers were available for this category. What is the basis for your contention that they did not have an opportunity to migrate? I believe virtually all of them came in.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes; up to that number. As you will recall, that number of 54,000 was, I think, approximately one-seventh or one-eighth of the total number authorized under the bill. So, therefore, although there were a larger number of destitute persons among them, they had about one-seventh, one-eighth, or one-tenth of the opportunities to migrate.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you this: Under this bill as it is presently drafted, a definition of a German expellee would embrace some of the expellees that you have in mind, would it not?

Mr. FINUCANE. This language is vague. It is possible to interpret it that way.

Mr. ARENS. I don't see how you can avoid interpreting it to include some of the expellees that you have been talking about.

Mr. FINUCANE. Where it says except the Soviet zone of occupation, that phrase definitely excludes the German escapees who came out and are coming out of the eastern zone of Germany, the Soviet zone of Germany.

Mr. ARENS. But it does not exclude the German ethnics from Eastern Europe other than from the Soviet zone.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct. That number is 8,300,000.

Mr. ARENS. Which number?

Mr. FINUCANE. The German expellees. In this definition that you have here, section 2 (b), that is 8,300,000. But if you pay attention to the last clause "who has not been firmly resettled," it cuts it down to 3 million. It is estimated there are 3 million who have not been more or less satisfactorily resettled.

Mr. ARENS. I am fearful that perhaps my questions are confusing you rather than to clear the record. Maybe I better let you go ahead, and if I don't understand you by the time you get through, we will come back.

Mr. FINUCANE. Could I recapitulate, perhaps, briefly?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mr. FINUCANE. The term escapee as it is used in this bill includes two categories of persons. It includes as used in section 2 (a), both non-German escapees and German escapees. The non-German escapees amount to 300,000, of whom we estimate 200,000 have not been firmly resettled. The German escapees in Western Germany and Berlin amount to 2 million, of whom we estimate 750,000 have not been firmly resettled. The expellees referred to in the next section, or the next paragraph, rather, section 2 (b), amount to 9,300,000, and we estimate that 3 million of them have not been firmly resettled.

Mr. ARENS. Why do you confine your estimates to Germany? According to the definition of the escapee there is no requirement that the escapee be at the operating effect of the bill, in Germany.

Mr. FINUCANE. Section 4 (a) (1) provides "not to exceed 110,000 visas to escapees and German expellees," residing in the German area.

Mr. ARENS. That is in the place where they allocate the visas, is it not?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes. So it would cover the escapees who are in Germany. The other escapees, the 15,000 in the other parts of Europe that you are thinking about, come in the following paragraph, section 4 (a) (2). That, we believe, is another reason for breaking up the escapees into two different types in section 2 (a), because there is

another outlet of 15,000 persons for them in section 4 (a) (2), which covers escapees in the other NATO countries of Europe.

Mr. ARENS. Would you then approve the definition of German expellee which appears in the bill?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Make a comment with reference to that.

Mr. FINUCANE. That definition seems to be satisfactory if it is made clear that under "escapees," the German escapees are included and are provided for in sufficient number, which is the ratio that I have proposed. If this proposal we make, which is a numerical proposal, and assumes that one person is as good as another, and therefore a thousand persons should have a thousand times the chance to come in that one has; that is, if, the opportunity is divided numerically, on that basis which we have worked out, and I will repeat, one-fifteenth for the non-German escapees, three-fifteenths for the German escapees, and the balance, eleven-fifteenths for the expellees—

Mr. ARENS. Do you think that the number of visas allocated under this act should bear a direct ratio to the number in each of the categories over there?

Mr. FINUCANE. To each of the categories that I have just mentioned. That is, non-German escapees, escapees and expellees, yes.

Mr. ARENS. Let me make an observation and see how you react to it. One of the prior witnesses said that there ought to be a ratio, but that the ratio ought to be not to the number there, but to the number that ought to be migrated. For example, in the expellee category, you have, according to our figures, approximately 8 million in Germany.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. But of the expellee category there are considerably fewer than 8 million who are potential or prospective migrants. I just pose that query to you. Shouldn't your ratio work on the number of prospective migrants rather than the number in the entire category, because a great number of the expellees have been integrated.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes. We would agree to that. The determination as to whether a person is a prospective migrant would be in part determined by his need, by the condition of his needs where he is now located. The figures are, and we have taken these figures into our calculation, that 3 million expellees are not firmly resettled, and therefore want to migrate and probably are eligible to migrate.

Mr. ARENS. Then your ratio would be on a ratio tied into your 3 million rather than the 8 million.

Mr. FINUCANE. Exactly.

Mr. ARENS. Then you have the same position, I believe, as Mr. Roland Elliott. I believe he was the witness who made that observation.

Mr. FINUCANE. I spoke to him about it a couple of days ago and we seemed to agree on the general idea, although I did not discuss these particular figures with him.

Incidentally, if I might translate the figures into final number of visas, it would come to something like this: Non-German escapees, 7,000; German escapees, 20,000; German expellees, 80,000. That adds up to about 107,000.

Mr. ARENS. Would you have any cutoff date, if you were doing it, to the expellee category or refugee category?

Mr. FINUCANE. I do not think there is any necessity or hardly a necessity of a cutoff date for the expellee category because there are no expulsions that I know of that have taken place recently. On the cutoff date for the escapees, I just want to say that I think there is a danger, by broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain, and particularly by sending news of this bill behind the Iron Curtain, that a number of people may be encouraged to cross the border and to escape, for whom we will not be able to supply housing, clothing, transportation, or migration opportunities. It might be well, although I would not stress the point, it might be well to set a cutoff date of around May 15, the day on which the bill was introduced, 1953. I, incidentally, disagree with the administration witnesses who were here, who said that this bill should be passed to encourage persons to come from behind the Iron Curtain. I think they should stay there and bear witness to what they believe in.

Mr. ARENS. Is your organization, or do you have views with respect to the situation in the Far East and in the Middle East as to—

Mr. FINUCANE. We have views on a lot of areas, since you asked about the Far East.

Mr. ARENS. We have received testimony with reference to that. I thought in view of the fact that you were an organization to prevent war, you probably are concerned with outside of central Europe.

Mr. FINUCANE. Before I go to the Far East, could I make one reference to this illustrated booklet?¹ In table 2, the proportions between the non-German escapees, German escapees, and expellees are very clearly illustrated. It might be useful to put that page into the record, if you think it will not cost the Government too much money.

In Asia, I think the people of America are being defrauded by the pretense of keeping the Chinese prisoners of war under allied custody on an asserted basis of principle. I do not think there is in this issue any principle that rates high in the hierarchy of moral values. It seems to me the question is whether or not we are going to have a war. We should not have a war over this question. It seems to me the question is whether or not we are going to draft Americans to protect these Chinese captives. That is just on the question of the moral aspects or the value aspects. From the political aspects it seems to me rather odd that we draft people here and take them away from their homes and send them over there, equip them with the most modern weapons of destruction for killing these Chinese and as soon as a few of these Chinese come over to our lines, the whole apparatus of destruction is turned to the defense of these Chinese, and we are told that this apparatus of destruction must continue to function with the daily increasing danger of world war, simply to protect the asserted desire of these Chinese not to return to their homeland. I believe that these Chinese do want to return to their homeland.

Mr. ARENS. I did not mean to precipitate a discussion of the prisoner of war issue. I was only wondering if the view of your organization coincided with the views of the Dr. Judd theory and 1 or 2 others.

Mr. FINUCANE. That they should be allowed to migrate to the United States?

¹ "Some Facts About Expellees in Germany," published by the Federal Ministry for Expellees of the West German Government, 1952.

Mr. ARENS. That there ought to be some concern expressed for the refugees in the Far East and in the Middle East, in addition to the Central European refugees.

Mr. FINUCANE. We think that the start that was made by the McCarran bill last year is a good step in the direction of taking care of migration from the Far East. We do not think that any radical change in migration from the Far East to the United States should be undertaken at the present time. As for those Chinese prisoners, I heard the proposal made here by Alfred Kohlberg that they be admitted to the United States as immigrants. I think that is a crime against those Chinese to get them in American captivity, submit them to all kinds of blandishments and pressures and lead them to indicate a desire to come to the United States to live here. I cannot even contemplate it being within the realm of possibility by our administration. I hope they will not think about it.

Mr. Chairman, that completes the testimony that I have prepared. I thank you very much.

Mr. ARENS. We appreciate your kindness and courtesy in presenting your views and information to the committee.

I believe we have skipped a witness. Is Mr. Edelsberg here?

STATEMENT OF HERMAN EDELSBERG, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE, B'NAI B'RITH

Mr. EDELSBERG. My name is Herman Edelsberg. I am the Washington representative of the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith.

May I begin with two preliminary observations. It is a matter of regret to us that our national chairman is unable to be here today because of prior commitments. Mr. Schultz, the national chairman, who is chairman of the executive committee of the board of higher education in New York City, and a distinguished lawyer, formerly counsel to Mayor LaGuardia, was very much concerned with his inability to appear here.

Second, may I express my appreciation for the painstaking and objective way in which the chairman of this subcommittee has tried to get at the facts in this important problem confronting our Nation.

Mr. Arens, the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith welcomes this opportunity to appear and present its views to this committee to testify in support of President Eisenhower's proposal to admit 240,000 special quota immigrants during the next 2 years.

B'nai B'rith, founded in 1843, is the oldest and largest civic organization of American Jews. It has a membership of 350,000 men and women. The Antidefamation League was organized in 1913, as a division of the parent organization in order to combat racial and religious prejudice in the United States. The program developed by the league is designed to achieve the following objectives: To eliminate and counteract defamation and discrimination against the various racial, religious, or ethnic groups which comprise our American people; to counteract un-American and antidemocratic activity; to advance good will and mutual understanding among American groups; and to encourage and translate into greater effectiveness the ideals of American democracy.

May I say we are not concerned with any form of special pleading. The rights we ask for the people we represent are rights that we insist should be granted to all other Americans, regardless of creed or color. The league has always worked to preserve our country as a beacon of hope for the oppressed and persecuted of the world. Hence, it has always advocated a humane immigration policy which would reflect our ideals of freedom, enhance our moral and spiritual leadership of the free nations of the world and promote the economic well-being of our country.

President Eisenhower, after reviewing carefully the world situation and our own national requirements, recommended the enactment of emergency immigration legislation. Nevertheless, many sincere Americans have raised questions about the impact which the influx of these newcomers would have on the internal security of our country. It was therefore most reassuring, Mr. Chairman, when the Under Secretary of State, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, the former Chief of Staff of the Allied Armies in Europe and former head of the CIA, in testifying before this committee declared that "all necessary protections with respect to security are provided for."

I am glad that the chairman of this committee when he introduced his bill, designed to implement the President's proposal, gave similar assurances that every possible security measure would be taken to prevent subversives from getting into the country. General Smith also added that the President's program "will assist in relieving situations which, under certain circumstances, would adversely affect the national security of the United States by undermining the economic and political stability of our allies."

We regard the objectives of the President's proposal as humanitarian, and consistent with our country's best interests. We believe that his program of emergency legislation will be of real help to the homeless refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny and to the surplus peoples of Western Europe. We should however, in candor, point out that emergency and temporary legislation of this kind is made necessary by the failure of Congress to reform the unrealistic, outmoded, and discriminatory national origins quota system which was adopted in the 1920's and which, unfortunately, reflected the anti-immigration philosophy of that era. Experience has shown that a large part of the annual quotas go to waste because they have been assigned to countries whose people have evidenced little interest in emigrating to the United States. On the other hand, the countries of Europe which have a need for emigration and the countries now trapped in the Soviet orbit, from which anti-Communist refugees have escaped at the risk of their lives, have only small and inadequate quotas. If the United States had a more flexible and a more just system of selecting immigrants for admission to our shores, one free from racist standards and one more clearly attuned to our domestic welfare and international needs, there might be no necessity for enacting emergency legislation of this character.

While we have not examined the several specific proposals designed to implement the President's program, we would like to suggest that no unworkable procedures and priorities be written into the law which would defeat the very purpose of the program. We would suggest that provision should also be made for those who fled from totalitarian

terror and cannot return because of a fear of persecution but are denied the privilege of citizenship in the countries in which they have taken refuge.

I think we have in mind the situation in France and Belgium in particular. Less than 1 year has elapsed since our country closed its books on another great emergency immigration program—the displaced-persons program which was authorized by the 80th Congress on June 25, 1948. But already it has become clear that that program which accomplished the resettlement of 400,000 persons in all of the 48 States and in the Territories of the United States has been a success. It enriched the economic and cultural life of our country, strengthened friendships with our allies, gave new life and hope to the victims of tyranny and persecution, and at the same time reaffirmed our traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. The President's recommendation if enacted into law will, we are sure, have a like effect.

Mr. Arens, I cannot forego this opportunity of addressing myself briefly to some of the mischievous notions which have been heretofore expressed by some very sincere and distinguished witnesses. I have in mind their references to an American way of life and the suggestion that their narrow notions constitute the American way of life. I think the beginning of wisdom and understanding of the American way of life is to recognize that it is compounded of many ways. If I may use a figure of speech, some of those ways are blind alleys, some byroads and some end in swamps. I would suggest the notion that if one particular national group deems itself responsible for the greatness of this country, or if one particular religion thinks it has done more for this country than another, that is one of the byroads and not the mainstream of the American way of life. I think we ought to recognize this.

While the American ideal has been one of religious living, too many of the people who came to this country in the search of liberty for themselves were very uncharitable in providing similar liberties for others. I have before me a pamphlet authorized by Mr. Edward Corsi, a distinguished author in the field of immigration, called *Paths to the New World*, and it is published by the league.

I was very much interested in reading a letter that Mr. Corsi includes in that pamphlet, written by Cotton Mather, leader of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. It is dated September 16, 1682. It is addressed to:

TO YE AGED AND BELOVED, MR. JOHN HIGGINSON:

There be now at sea a ship called *Welcome*, which has on board one hundred or more of the heretics and malignants called Quakers, with W. Penn, who is the chief scamp, at the head of them. The General Court has accordingly given secret orders to Master Malachi Huscott, of the brig *Porpoise*, to waylay the said *Welcome* slyly as near the Cape of Cod as may be, and make captive the said Penn and his ungodly crew, so that the Lord may be glorified and not mocked on the soil of this new country with the heathen worship of these people. Much spoil can be made by selling the whole lot to Barbadoes, where slaves fetch good prices in rum and sugar, and we shall not only do the Lord great service by punishing the wicked, but we shall make good for His Minister and people.

Yours in the bowels of Christ,

COTTON MATHER.

To add irony to irony, the Quakers adopted in 1729 a law imposing duties on foreigners and Irish servants brought into Pennsylvania, to discourage the great importation and coming in, and I am quoting the law, "of numbers of foreigners and lewd, idle, and ill-affected persons."

We know that in the early colonies, Quakers and Papists were chased from pillory to post. It was a crime to practice the faith of the Society of Friends. So we find that American practice and the American way of life is not always the American way of life.

If I may, I would suggest that the American way of life was spelled out by the founding fathers in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution, when they said all men are created equal. They issued the most eloquent and ringing invitation to the peoples of the world to come to this country and join with them in settling it. They asked for no proof of national origin, and they set up no national quotas. Their test was loyalty to the basic idea of this country, support of the principle of freedom and equality for all Americans. That is the American way of life as I see it. I think to a great extent our immigration system has departed from that basic American way of life.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you, sir.

According to the schedule of witnesses, the next witnesses are Dr. Peter Zenkl and Dr. Joseph Lettrich of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

Will you gentlemen kindly each identify yourselves?

**STATEMENTS OF JAN PANEK AND ADOLPH KLIMEK, ON BEHALF
OF THE COUNCIL OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA, WASHINGTON,
D. C.**

Mr. PANEK. My name is Jan Panek, representing the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. This is Mr. Adolph Klimek.

Mr. ARENS. You may proceed.

Mr. PANEK. Mr. Chairman, we have prepared a statement in the name of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia in connection with the emergency bill that is before the subcommittee.

May I read this statement and then add a few words to it?

Mr. ARENS. Please proceed.

Mr. PANEK. The exodus westward of Czechoslovak political escapees began when Czechoslovak democracy, standing alone in central Europe in the struggle against Communist attack, had succumbed to the enormous pressure of Communist expansions from Moscow and the Soviet lust for conquest. The Czechoslovak political escapees began to leave Czechoslovakia in large numbers immediately after the Communist putsch on February 25, 1948; that is why the number of Czechoslovak political escapees is so high beginning with that date. The records of IRO give the number at approximately 55,000; the real figure is, however, much higher. Many of them in their desire to move westward as quickly as possible went without IRO's help and without registering with IRO. The reason for this is mainly psychological; a state of mind caused by the suffering endured during the Nazi occupation.

Along the western frontiers, Communist border areas were gradually cleared of trees and bushes so that it is virtually impossible to

cross undetected. This no-man's land is laced with a network of barbed wire, land mines, signal rockets, and detection devices. Armed guards, accompanied by dogs, constantly patrol the areas and others watch from observation towers. But freedom-loving people continue to escape.

The majority of these escapees have emigrated, in the meantime, across the sea, a large number also to the United States. The Displaced Persons Acts of 1948 and 1950, prompted by American understanding and desire to alleviate great suffering, have been a great help.

Nevertheless, there still remain as of this date some 11,000 Czechoslovak political escapees in the countries of Europe of whom about 5,000 are in the so-called first zone countries in refugee camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy. Most of them, approximately 4,600 in number, are in Germany and Austria. Practically all of them escaped several years ago, yet could not be resettled nor integrated, as yet, into local economies.

They are democrats by conviction. We agree fully that they be screened because it is in the interests of democracy to protect itself against any possible infiltration by Communist agents. In many cases they have been waiting in the camps for long years. They continue to believe in the understanding and help of the democratic West. If the United States of America admits them, it will also be an excellent argument against Kremlin propaganda. These tried and trustworthy democrats are all experienced and good workers and their integration in the political, economic, and social system of the free world will be a good investment.

In its present form, the Immigration and Nationality Act does not provide any solution to the problem of those escapees who have not, as yet, been able to emigrate.

All political escapees, the Czechoslovaks among them, are deeply grateful to President Eisenhower for his support of emergency immigration legislation. They welcome the pending bill of Senator Arthur V. Watkins and others in the hope that it will help to solve their difficulties.

The problem of these escapees is in the rebuilding of hope by offering them an opportunity to make a new home and to become self-respecting and productive members of a free democratic society. Contrary to what they have suffered and later on what they have heard and read in the Communist press and radio, it is made clear to them that their needs and their decision to join the forces of freedom are matters of deep concern to the United States of America.

Our suggestions are presented as a contribution toward a solution in the intentions of the sponsors of the bill.

(1) According to section 4 (a) (1) during the 2 years beginning 120 days after the enactment of this act there shall be allotted 110,000 visas to escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria.

Thus, political escapees of non-German origin from behind the Iron Curtain countries, now in refugee camps in Germany and Austria, should benefit by this act.

In our opinion, it would be extremely difficult to administer the new law without specifying the number assigned to non-German escapees.

We believe it highly advisable to stipulate specifically the exact numbers in the act itself to avoid unnecessary difficulties later. This would carry out the intentions of section 8 (a) of the bill.

Moreover, this requirement of the law could hardly be met if the act did not clearly designate in exact figures the limit for both these main groups: the Germans in one, and all the other political escapees of various nationalities in the other group.

We recommend, therefore: that the proposed section 4 (a) (1) be changed to read:

not to exceed twenty thousands visas to escapees other than German and ninety thousand visas to German escapees and expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria * * *.

Undoubtedly, it is also in Austria's and Germany's own interest to free themselves of these foreign political escapees living on their territory and taxing their economy.

2. According to section 4 (2) the allocation shall—

not exceed fifteen thousand visas to escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey or in the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside * * *.

3. We call attention:

A. To the fact that, as worded, "within the European continental limits," the act would deprive anti-Communist political escapees now temporarily residing in the United Kingdom of its benefits.

Many anti-Communist political escapees from behind the Iron Curtain are now in England; there are more than 3,000 Czechoslovaks there now. Strained economic conditions often make it impossible for them to earn a livelihood, yet they, too, should be permitted to emigrate and to become fully employed members of our society.

B. The bill, as worded, also excludes political escapees now living in Switzerland and Sweden

Escapees residing within the European limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization * * *.

Many of the Czechoslovak political escapees, who would otherwise be eligible for immigration and desirous of coming to the United States, are living temporarily in these countries. This is especially true of Czechoslovak students who are now in Switzerland for this country recognized their past scholastic achievements and they can finish their education. We believe that the fact that they are now living in the democratic countries of Sweden and Switzerland should not bar them from immigration to the United States under the emergency immigration act. From the standpoint of the escapees qualification, which should be the governing factor, it would not seem fair to discriminate against them.

We therefore recommend that political escapees now residing in all the democratic European countries be included, without exception, in the benefits of the act.

4. We hope that the text of the act is clear on this point: that these 240,000 immigrants admitted under the emergency act will in no way affect the normal immigration quotas of the respective countries.

5. It is not clear from the text of section 6 (a) whether recognized voluntary agencies are also to be empowered to issue the necessary assurances as it was the case under the DP legislation.

To conclude, we hope that this emergency legislation will be approved by the United States Congress. It will strengthen the confidence of those who, believing in freedom and democracy, have risked their lives in escaping from communism. At the same time it will give fresh courage to those Democrats, still resisting communism behind the Iron Curtain as their persecution by the godless materialistic Communist scourge continues.

Now, sir, we have concentrated our remarks on five points of the bill. The first one is, as I mentioned, that there should be a differentiation between the German nationals and the nationals from the other countries behind the Iron Curtain, who are presently in Germany or Austria. Our recommendation that the number, as it is mentioned in the bill, 110,000, should be divided in 20,000 non-German and 90,000 German is based on the fact that during the last 5 years the number of the escapees who came out of the countries behind the Iron Curtain was about 100,000.

Out of these, almost 80,000 already are resettled in the democratic world, in the Western World. There are remaining about 20,000 of them, while new escapees, based on an estimate of last year, are coming at the rate of about 300 a month, which would increase this number to maybe 26,000 or over.

We thought that because many of these will go to other countries, allocation of 20,000 out of the 110,000 quota to non-German escapees would cover the necessities.

Mr. ARENS. Sir, is it your overall point on that that the numbers to be allocated by the act should be in a ratio to the number in each of the many categories?

Mr. PANEK. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. In other words, among the refugees as distinct from the expellees, you have German and non-German refugees, German and non-German expellees, and then you have them in various categories, in camp, out of camp, those that have been resettled and integrated, and so forth.

Mr. PANEK. We felt, from what we know of the situation there, that two categories would be satisfactory, German expellees and escapees, and in the other category all the escapees, non-German escapees, from all the other countries behind the Iron Curtain, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Baltic countries, and so on, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the others. They would be in one category. That would be our proposal as far as this part of the bill is concerned.

The other difficulty we have is that the bill does not cover the escapees who reside today in Great Britain.

Senator WATKINS. Why should it?

Mr. PANEK. They came there temporarily.

Senator WATKINS. Should not Great Britain and other countries help take some of these people?

Mr. PANEK. There is such a situation there that there are many that would stay, but even those that can stay cannot find a decent occupation to work in.

Senator WATKINS. Why cannot the British help them go to the other nations of the British Commonwealth, the United Kingdom? Why cannot they take care of them? How many are there?

Mr. PANEK. There are about 3,000 Czechoslovaks there.

Senator WATKINS. That is a small number.

Mr. PANEK. The whole number is of those escapees from Czechoslovakia in the last 5 years.

Mr. ARENS. They don't have any in camps in Great Britain?

Mr. PANEK. No.

Mr. ARENS. They are on the economy of Great Britain?

Mr. PANEK. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. And they are working in Great Britain?

Mr. PANEK. Some of them. But not many of them are working, because they cannot find occupations or they cannot work because they are there only temporarily.

Senator WATKINS. Under what circumstances did they get to Great Britain?

Mr. PANEK. They received temporary visas to come into the country because of various reasons. They had friends who helped them. They could not stay. The conditions in Germany were such that they hoped they would live under better conditions temporarily until they would be definitely resettled in that country.

Senator WATKINS. It seems to me that if they have only 3,000 of them there, that is a very small number for the British to take care of. If they cannot take care of them in the British Isles, they certainly have plenty of places in the world where they can. What we are trying to do is to get at these people where they have become such a terrific problem. We expect to have the other free nations get in and do something about them, too. It has been said here today that some of these other countries have not done anything.

Mr. PANEK. Out of the hundred thousand escapees, the figure I mentioned, about 70,000 already are resettled in the West, and as far as Czechoslovak escapees are concerned, the largest number went to Australia. The second largest went to Canada, and then the United States. The bulk came to these three countries. But the largest is in Australia, then Canada, and then the United States.

They continue to go there. We try and do resettlement with them in Canada, but there is altogether about 11,000 of them all over Europe, including Great Britain, who need permanent resettlement. This bill, if enacted, would help to get a large percentage of them into this country, very far from the complete number of them.

Senator WATKINS. How many went to Canada?

Mr. PANEK. Into Canada, of Czechoslovaks, over 6,000.

Senator WATKINS. Are they still in Canada?

Mr. PANEK. They are still. They are permanently in Canada. In Australia we have about 14,000. In this country, during the last 4 years, we have almost the same number, about 6,000, that came to the United States.

Senator WATKINS. You have heard the statements made that the immigrants that went to Canada did not stay there, that they somehow or other found their way across the border into the United States.

Mr. PANEK. If there are, they are exceptions, if such people come. But almost without exception, they are detected and turned back. All of them have their occupations, maybe with a few exceptions, I am sure of that because there are many others who come.

Senator WATKINS. Are you in touch with them so that you would know they are still in Canada?

Mr. PANEK. Definitely. And we are still bringing new ones to Canada. For example, we are negotiating with the Canadian Gov-

ernment to bring in, within a very short period, about 200 new people from Germany and Austria.

Mr. ARENS. How many was that?

Mr. PANEK. Two hundred new people out of those in Germany. This is one case that we are actually negotiating at this point.

Senator WATKINS. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. PANEK. No; I am not. I represent the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. I was Czechoslovak before the Communists took over, Czechoslovakian Ambassador, permanent representative to the United Nations. So the other cases, those who are in Switzerland and Sweden, the bill does not apply to them.

Senator WATKINS. Again, why should the United States take those who are in Sweden and Switzerland? Why cannot they stay there?

Mr. PANEK. We succeeded, to give you an example, in getting most or a very large part of our students who could not finish their studies in any other country, to have them brought to Switzerland to finish their studies. But, on a condition that they must leave the country after they finished the studies. They are continuing in that. If, when finishing the studies, they would stay, they would be expelled. It is a temporary state of affairs.

I think after finishing the studies they would be, as I said, in any of the western countries. The largest part of them, again, goes to Australia. But there will be eligible ones who will want to come to this country. I know, for example, they study engineering. We had many demands, even here, that engineers would be welcome. Such people we would like to bring here. So those are two points that we feel should be corrected.

Senator WATKINS. You see what happens when the present administration tries to do something to help in the worst areas, then immediately everybody from everywhere feels that this would be a golden opportunity to get in, and they make it difficult for us to carry out the program at all. You see, the American people are going a long way, the administration is going a long way, in view of the vote of Congress a year ago, to pass the McCarran Act by more than a two-thirds majority, to even propose this emergency legislation. I am in hopes that the people from the various countries will not try to expand it and make it more difficult to have enacted and to have sustained by American public opinion.

Mr. PANEK. We have just this problem, as I mentioned, with the conditions in the two countries.

Senator WATKINS. I do not blame you for feeling that you would like to have it done. But cannot you understand you make it more difficult when you ask to bring them out of Switzerland, Sweden, and Great Britain?

Mr. PANEK. A large number of these people who, for political reasons, left, they want to be integrated into the western democratic society, and they would be discriminated against, would be excluded.

Senator WATKINS. Are they, for instance, Czech nationals or of ethnic origin?

Mr. PANEK. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. What about the records? You heard the criticisms about records that have been made. Is there any way for them to give us their past histories, or for us to check into them for security purposes?

Mr. PANEK. Definitely.

Senator WATKINS. How can you check them?

Mr. PANEK. They are checked by the United States authorities.

Senator WATKINS. They are checked by us with what we have, but obviously you cannot go into Czechoslovakia to check them. What we can find out is what they tell us.

Mr. PANEK. They are known to those outside, their past histories are known that they have helped and worked underground against the Communists. When they came to the line that their lives were in danger, then they tried to escape. There are many of them who died in trying to escape. According to our statistics, only about 60 percent of those who try really succeed, and 40 percent are killed or caught and jailed. But in most of these cases, almost without exception, we have such people who work there and in one or another way they were informed that their lives are in danger, and then they went west. That is the situation. The United States authorities are informed of this situation and of what these people represent.

Senator WATKINS. You have been here, have you not, during the hearings?

Mr. PANEK. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. You have heard the criticisms of the attempts to check these people for security reasons.

Mr. PANEK. I agree fully. They should be.

Senator WATKINS. I know they should be, but you have heard the statements made that it cannot be done.

Mr. PANEK. I think it can be done. We have possibilities. I know, if asked by the authorities, our people have possibilities to check fully and be in a way responsible for their democratic convictions and full cooperation with us.

Senator WATKINS. I think you are asking too much, to ask us to now amend this legislation to take in the few that are in Switzerland and the few that are in Great Britain, and the few that are in Sweden.

Mr. PANEK. It applies to all of Western Europe except these three countries. I wondered why it should not apply even to those, because there is no difference as far as these escapees are concerned.

Senator WATKINS. Because there is no pressure at those points. We haven't a lot of excess people there that are endangering anybody's economy. But we do have dangers caused by those that escaped into the countries immediately bordering on the satellite countries. That is where we are having the difficulty. They are coming across in such numbers that West Germany cannot take care of them all as much as they would like to. Other countries, such as Italy, are getting some, but they have had returnees from colonies who have created difficulties there. We expect our ally, Great Britain, and we expect Sweden and Switzerland, and a number of the free nations, to do their share.

Mr. PANEK. I am sure that many of these escapees will remain in Sweden. If they can, they will remain.

Senator WATKINS. They will remain there if somebody else won't take them, that is certain.

Mr. PANEK. It is just those who cannot stay and find a livelihood there. That would be the only reason for them to stay.

Senator WATKINS. Well, there is still room in Canada and still plenty of room in Australia and some in South America and other

countries. The United States is making this gesture. You must remember that we are having an increasing population here, one that will bring us to the 200 million population mark here in 20 years. We have our own problems. We just cannot open the floodgates. It was said the minute we offered a bill of this kind everybody would want to flock in and expand it here and there, in every direction.

Mr. PANEK. Well, whether we like it or not, the United States is the haven, No. 1, for these people.

Senator WATKINS. It may be. But it will not be for long if we overdo it.

Mr. PANEK. This is really their feeling, their conviction. As long as they see the United States is helping them, even if not all of them, it may be 30 percent of all of them that will come here, but still even if the rest of them feel the United States is behind us, we don't need to fear. That feeling means terribly much.

Senator WATKINS. We do not want to go under any false colors here or give any false impressions. I am assured by the highest authorities in the executive branch that this is it, and that they are not going to ask for any future emergency legislation along this line. It has been said by the critics who have been here, and you have heard them, that this is just another step for another bill, and another bill, and another bill. But I am assured that there will be no further requests.

Mr. PANEK. On the other hand, sir, there is no doubt that as long as there will be regimes such as we have today in Moscow, in Prague, in Warsaw, Budapest, and in the other countries, there will be escapees. In one or in another way, I feel that it is our duty to help them.

Senator WATKINS. What do you mean by our duty?

Mr. PANEK. It is ours, and as I said—

Senator WATKINS. You are not an American citizen.

Mr. PANEK. I am talking to help them. This is one of the ways to help, to back the United States authorities to help as much as is possible.

Senator WATKINS. What I am trying to say to you is to be moderate in this and do not build up any false expectations on any assumptions that this is going to be expanded or we are going to have another program like this. I am holding the executive branch firmly to what they said, that this will be the last, and that there will not be another emergency that they will ask the Congress to act upon in this direction.

Mr. PANEK. Any achievement and any help given to these unfortunate people is gratefully acknowledged, and I think it will pay even now, and even in the future, as far as the good will and position of this great country is concerned.

Senator WATKINS. I have deep feelings of sympathy for these people, on humanitarian grounds and all other grounds. But I recognize this, that if we do things that will help break down this country, which is one of the last great hopes of the people of the free world, then we have lost the battle. After all is said and done, no matter how deep our sympathies are for these people, there are limits beyond which we cannot go and still maintain a country that can stand up and fight in the final showdown. So we do not want our friends to overdo this. I am just handing this out as a little warning as one member of the

committee. Maybe others will not feel that way about it. But some are a little stronger than I am, as you know, in the direction that they will not take these extra peoples.

Mr. PANEK. We are grateful for every help that is given to these unfortunate people.

Senator WATKINS. I found every member of this committee, without exception, to be very deeply concerned about the plight of these people. They have just as strong feelings of wanting to help these unfortunate people as anyone else. But after all is said and done, they have a great responsibility to see that the United States of America remains strong, that it does not bring itself down to ruin in trying to help others.

If it brings itself down it will be a poor instrument, indeed, to wage any final conflict with the Communist or any other subversive activity that might appear in the world. We are not through yet. We have had differences of alliances. People now our enemies were at one time our allies, and people who at one time were our enemies, are now our friends. This is a rapidly changing world and we never know where we are going from one 10-year period to another. So under those circumstances, our No. 1 obligation is to keep America strong.

Mr. PANEK. Sir, if I may state, out of those who came to this country during the last 5 years, without any exception, we can be proud how great an asset they are not only to the economy, and to the general help in the fight, but we also feel sure that the others would be of the same caliber if they would be admitted to this country. They are not a burden, they will not be a burden. But they want to help and strengthen the economy of this country.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. PANEK. I have one point, yet, sir, just for clarification.

Senator WATKINS. We still have two more witnesses.

Mr. PANEK. This concerns section 6 (a). It is that the assurances should be signed by the American citizens, but I am not sure whether this includes also the recognized voluntary agencies as it was in the DP Act. It just states "citizen" or "citizens." That is not clear.

Mr. ARENS. Somebody said from the State Department the other day that it was contemplated that that would embrace voluntary agencies on blanket assurances basis, if that is helpful to you.

Mr. PANEK. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Is Mr. Raies here?

STATEMENT OF NORMAN W. RAIES, ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. RAIES. My name is Norman W. Raies. I am a native-born American, of Syrian-Lebanese descent. I believe that although there have been several—

Senator WATKINS. Would you kindly give us your full name and address?

Mr. RAIES. I live here in Washington.

Senator WATKINS. Your street address.

Mr. RAIES. Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va., is my residence.

Senator WATKINS. Do you represent any group or organization?

Mr. RAIES. I was going to get into that. I don't exactly represent a group, because my group is the only nationality group in the whole

country which does not have a political arm. They feel that they have become so intensely integrated into the United States citizenry that they feel anything that is of a political nature might not be exactly proper, so the organizations that we do have, and I have organized a lot of them myself which I will tell you about in a minute, are not actually permitted to participate in any political activity. While this is not exactly technically political, I guess you construe it as such, because it is regarding legislation even though it is international in nature.

However, I do believe that I voice the sentiments of the million people in this country who are of Syrian-Lebanese descent. I have organized the western federation in California, in the Western States, the Syrian-American council in Los Angeles, the first American Legion post for Syrians in this country, and headed up all of them, incidentally, too, as well as being the organizer, all of which are going strong today.

Currently I am a reporter for the Middle East Newspapers, in the 11 Arabic countries and this country, too, the only one in Washington. So I believe that my sentiments will pretty much reflect those of this particular group, both in the country and even those abroad, since into this discussion has come the very questionable, in my mind, objection made or protested by the foreign countries against our immigration policy.

I do think, speaking for myself and for most of the groups that I know, that we believe in the American system of immigration as it is set up, even as it has been implemented by the McCarran-Walter Act. There may be some inequities that we are not aware of. If there are, we have full confidence that those inequities will be eliminated by the orderly processes that the United States Government recognizes and proceeds on.

With regard to this one bill, Senate bill 1917, while I am not too well informed on it, and I don't have a prepared statement, and am not too well prepared to speak on it, I believe that our sentiments would be against it. I believe that my own personal sentiments would be best reflected in a passage in the Congressional Record which was placed there at my instigation by Congressman Broyhill of Virginia, of a special broadcast made by Earl Godwin, whom I consider to be a great American, and who discussed the immigration policy and the so-called foreign antipathy toward it, in a broadcast some months ago. I don't have the date of that Congressional Record, but I believe it appeared a couple of months ago. If I can have time to get it into this record of the hearing, I would like to do so. I do want to say this, however, in this brief study of the bill, in the event that 1917 is adopted or adapted, we are wondering why the Arab group has not been included. In the first place—

Senator WATKINS. It is principally, as I understand it, because they do not desire to come to the United States.

Mr. RALES. That is true, Senator.

Senator WATKINS. Then why include them? Why stir up grief by putting more trouble on their heads if they do not want to come?

Mr. RALES. No, indeed, I understand. But I mean this: There is an immigration quota of only a hundred, for each country, which is very small.

Senator WATKINS. And you are satisfied with that?

MR. RAIES. Well, actually it is oversubscribed, and there are cases where others should come or could. They are not agitating it, and the country itself does not want to lose its citizens. However, in the event that any action is taken to take in more refugees, or for more foreign-born people, then I think consideration should be given if and when it is requested by these groups who feel like they do need it for one reason or another. For instance, the Arab refugees, they have the very same problem, although you don't hear much about it, as the other refugees.

Senator WATKINS. I understand that the Arab refugees do not desire to come. I think the answer to their problem is development within that area, and in helping out in some way for them to reestablish themselves in the countries where they now are, or other countries of their own people who would be willing to receive them.

MR. RAIES. That is probably true, except when you have a group of a million, I am sure there is not a unanimity of opinion. Furthermore, there is no desire to resettle in those other countries. If they do, they want to go back to the land they once occupied. Of course, that is controversial and they may not get to.

Senator WATKINS. It looks like they will not get it without a war and the winning of a war.

MR. RAIES. I just don't know what the situation will be. They are attempting to work it out there through the United Nations, and resolutions, and through the assistance of the United States and other organizations or countries which would like to see justice done. However, there are Arab refugees. I don't know how many could come here, if any, but I do know that they would be a good type in the event they did, because they are agricultural. I actually feel if the bill is adopted, it should be appended, if it is not already provided, that these people who come be restricted to certain activities like agriculture and certain locals, and restricted for a long period.

MR. ARENS. Are you familiar with S. 1766, a companion bill that the Senator from Utah put in?

MR. RAIES. I am not, Mr. Counsel. No. I did not know about this hearing until today. A party that was supposed to appear here left town, and so I took his place. I do not know whether I am voicing his views. For that reason I have not had an opportunity to see the bill. That is why I am speaking more or less informally, and dealing only in the principle of the thing to write up the Arab groups so they will be considered, all things being equal, and to explain that we do not agitate for any repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act at all. We think, as American citizens—

Senator WATKINS. We are glad to hear that, because the committee, at least a majority of it, is committed to the McCarran Act. And so am I, personally.

MR. RAIES. I think I can say, Senator, that nearly every other nationality group opposes it, rather bitterly, but I do not believe anybody in our group does. I do not believe any of the statements made by some of the other groups are accurate. I happen to know that the bishops of most of the churches that the Syrian-Lebanese groups belong to are not particularly interested. Everyone is pretty happy about this country. They don't feel there is such a thing as second-class citizens, or that there is any inequity. We feel we are pretty lucky. I am happy to say that all of my people have become pretty

substantial citizens. You know groups in your own area. I cannot speak officially for each individual one, but I believe I do reflect their opinion. I would like for the United States Government to know how we feel.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you for your statement.

Have we missed anyone? We have a list here. We have Mr. David Whatley as the last one here.

STATEMENT OF DAVID WHATLEY, BETHESDA, MD.

Mr. WHATLEY. I represent no organization. I appreciate your hearing me as a private citizen to express a point of view that is not—

Senator WATKINS. I know you very well, but probably others reading this record will not. You ought to identify yourself.

Mr. WHATLEY. I am a native-born American citizen, originally of Arkansas, and have lived in the District since 1930, and now reside in Bethesda, Md. My vocation is lawyer and real estate.

Senator WATKINS. Give us your street address.

Mr. WHATLEY. I represent no organization. I think I am not partial to any ethnic organizational group, nor do I have any connection with any organization that has appeared here as a previous witness. I think, however, most of the witnesses who have appeared will agree with the principles that I shall enunciate. I approach the whole problem first, primarily because of its political difficulty. I appreciate so much the diligence and devotion that you have given to the study of this most difficult political problem. I seek, by my testimony, to simplify it and enhance its possibilities of passage. I believe, as I said in my testimony on a similar bill before the House Judiciary Committee last year, that this approach which has been written into the administration bill, S. 1917, by the Executive, will not be accepted by the Congress. I therefore seek a practical means of achieving substantially the same objectives with which I am so heartily in accord in a simpler and more expeditious manner. I hope that my proposal might meet with your approval so that it can be gotten through both Houses of Congress before the Italian elections, even.

I would simply make available to every country in the world for a short period of 2 or 3 years, the quota numbers which that particular country did not utilize from the beginning of World War II, when the immigration pattern of the whole world was disrupted by the war. I would not propose to pool any quotas as was previously proposed in legislation introduced last year, and in the legislation seeking to amend the McCarran-Walter Act. I agree substantially with the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. I think the committees did a superb and monumental job. There may be imperfections but there are no patent discriminations in the act, in my opinion, that have been charged in political speeches in the past year. The misrepresentation on that point, I think, has been scandalous, and I include in that category a statement of Mr. Truman in the last election. I do, however, believe that the countries who did not utilize those quotas, by reason of the war, their own quotas, ought to be permitted to utilize them now for refugees only in this unusual, extraordinary circumstance, and for a temporary period of 2 or 3 years only. I would make only one exception to the doctrine of the national origins system,

and that would be for the benefit of the expellees in both Germany and Italy.

I feel that we are strongly morally obligated to the expellees, particularly in Germany, and I refer to the testimony earlier of Mr. Finucane. We are quite similarly obligated to the refugees from north Africa and other colonies of Italy, by reason of our participation in the Italian peace conference. We are obligated, I think, to the refugees of both of those countries and to Japan by reason of our bombing so many of them out of their homes.

I should like to point out a little known point which occurred in another statement, which points out that there are 2 million refugees in Italy alone which have been bombed out of their homes, and a much larger number in Germany. I think this country does not have an overriding obligation to relieve overpopulation either in Europe or anywhere else in the world.

I think we have a strong moral obligation to the Arab refugees which have been just referred to here. Certainly the Arabs feel that there should be no discrimination as between their refugees and the German refugees since we were party to the Palestine partition. That is a very debatable and important point, with which I am not fully conversant, but I cannot conceive that the Arab countries would not take offense at the terms of the present bill, which completely ignores their own refugees, in a similar situation with the German expellees, nor could I conceive that the Asiatics would not feel a resentment against being left out of this legislation.

There has been previously, of course, refugee legislation passed by the Congress which limited itself to Europe. I refer to the displaced persons bill. But in both the 1947 and 1950 bill there were not the categories which are set up, arbitrary categories, that are contained in the administration bill, and they did not give rise to charges of discrimination as between the various countries of Western Europe.

The only discrimination that was perpetrated in those bills was perpetrated upon the insistence of the million-dollar lobby, the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, who were diligent in their opposition to having anyone of German ancestry included in the bill, and only, as you remember, upon the insistence of Senator McCarran, Senator Langer, and others did the people of German ancestry overcome the discrimination that was written into the bill originally, adopting the definition of the displaced person which was contained in the IRO constitution, saying that displaced persons should meet certain qualifications, except that if he should be a war criminal, a common criminal, or a person of German ethnic origin, he would be ineligible.

The ratification by the United States Congress of that discrimination, it seems to me, is the most flagrant example of discrimination on account of race or nationality that has ever been written in any legislation in my memory. I hope that we can afford an expiation of that in the large number of expellees that could be included in this bill.

Relating to expellees I would propose the one exception I would make to the doctrine of charging the country of their birth. That is in the case of people who had been expelled from a country because of their race or nationality, I would make it possible to charge their quota numbers to their country of ancestry, the country to which they fled, such as Germany or Italy. I think that is important as a practical

matter, because the Iron Curtain countries from which the German expellees were expelled have such small quotas, most of which are relatively filled during those years.

I have just one brief additional word. I would also propose a priority as to time of expulsion or escape, by year, to make it administratively practicable.

Mr. ARENS. Do you mean a year prior to the effective date of any legislation?

Mr. WHATLEY. No, sir, Mr. Arens, I would say that the people who were expelled in 1946 would have priority for admission over those in 1947, and 1947 over 1948, and so forth. I believe in that manner you could obviate the enormous difficulties of adequate security screening for recent refugees so that the escapees of earlier origin would be processed first. I believe that any reasonable doubts as to the security of the people who have lived in Germany or Italy for the past 5 or 6 years could probably be resolved quite easily.

I would propose also a cutoff date so as to not encourage additional immigration from behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. ARENS. What cutoff date then do you suggest?

Mr. WHATLEY. The date of the enactment of the bill or the date of introduction of the bill, rather, May 15. I should briefly like to mention the Lodge amendment, which was referred to in earlier testimony. There have been, as was testified, only a few hundred people that were inducted into the United States Army pursuant to the provisions of the Lodge amendment which permitted 12,500. Senator Lodge originally proposed a very large number to be in that category. But the Pentagon persuaded him to reduce his numbers so that when the bill was originally enacted it contained only 1,250. It now has been amended to 12,500. But it is my strong impression that the Pentagon has systematically sabotaged the administration of the bill so that it could not appear to be an alternative to the draft of American boys, which I feel could become. As it is, we are now drafting doctors in this country up to the age of 50. The Senate passed the bill this afternoon, even to provide for that manpower, rather than bring in temporary doctors from another country. Incidentally, I think the bill was perhaps the most discriminatory class legislation and most unconstitutional piece of legislation I recall going through the Congress.

I am very grateful for your time. I would like permission to insert in the record a compilation of the unused quotas for each country in the world which would indicate the total number of refugees that could migrate here under my proposal.

Senator WATKINS. All right, we will receive it. We have these additional statements which have been submitted. The committee will consider those submitted with respect to their materiality and length, to determine whether or not we will include them all. I think we will leave the matter open until we have checked them and then only those that are material and relevant will be inserted in the record. We will leave it open at the moment.

Thank you, Mr. Whatley, for your appearance and your contribution.

The committee will now be in recess. Further hearings, if any, will be called by the chairman.

(Whereupon, at 5:20 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

EMERGENCY MIGRATION OF ESCAPEES, EXPELLEES, AND REFUGEES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 1 p. m., pursuant to call, in room 457, Senate Office Building, Hon. Arthur V. Watkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Watkins and Welker.

Present also: Richard Arens, staff director, and Drury Blair, staff member.

Senator WATKINS. The subcommittee will resume its session. I think Mrs. Tinkham had requested an opportunity to present her views. Will you come forward, Mrs. Tinkham?

STATEMENT OF MRS. MILDRED TAFT TINKHAM, HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

Senator WATKINS. Mrs. Tinkham, will you tell us your full name, address, and your occupation?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Mildred Taft Tinkham, T-i-n-k-h-a-m; address 2002 North Las Palmas Avenue, Hollywood 28, Calif.; business address, Taft Realty Co., 6322 Yucca Street; and I am secretary and treasurer of the company and a real-estate broker.

Senator WATKINS. You may proceed with your statement.

Mrs. TINKHAM. In the first place, I would like to tell you the groups that I am here representing and will report to. I have organized these lists of good-government groups in Los Angeles and vicinity to study legislation, and these are the groups:

- Good-government group, Los Angeles;
- Good-government group, Hollywood;
- Good-government group, Laguna Beach;
- Good-government group, Santa Monica;
- Good-government group of Hollywood;
- Good-government group of Los Angeles;
- Good-government group of Pasadena; and one in Glendale.

I am the legislative chairman for the Studio City Civic Club. I have asked to be the first speaker for the Pleiades Club of Los Angeles on the report from Washington. I will give another report to the Los Feliz Women's Club on the United Nations Charter. I am reporting to the Women's Breakfast Club, Los Angeles. I am reporting then to the library board of the Friday Morning Club of Los Angeles.

I have had a 2-hour talk with the legislative chairman of the Pro-America, and I shall report to her. I am reporting to the women's division of the Los Angeles Examiner to Dean Ward when I return.

Mr. ARENS. When you say you are reporting, do you write a publication?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Like Dean Ward asked me to come and speak to her when I reported legislation in Washington. I have been interested in legislation.

Mr. ARENS. You are not a newspaper reporter?

Mrs. TINKHAM. No. However, I was press chairman of the Studio City Civic Club for 2 years. In the Native Daughters of California, I was Americanism chairman, and in the Hill Toppers Republican Club, I have also taken an active interest and will report to the president, and also the public-relations department of the Hollywood Women's Club. That is part of the list.

Now, besides that, I will report to a number of individuals from whom I have had letters and telegrams, who are intensely interested in this Senate bill 1917 in the Senate of the United States as of May 15, 1953, Mr. Watkins, chairman.

The particular problems that we are interested in that concern this bill, the one certainly is the problem of assimilation, and in college it was certainly a problem that was studied years ago, a problem of assimilation and amalgamation.

At present we are having certain problems there in the West and we have certain groups there in the West whom we have special problems with. One problem is the Slavic group. Another problem concerns the Italian group. Another one concerns the Mexican group, and a number of other minority groups.

Now, in those problems, the one of assimilation is one of the most important problems, because we have found—and especially in my civic work, and I was chairman of the—our community—I am trying to think of the name of it. Anyway, we had all the problems in this group to study, and one of the most important was the problem of the groups, the minority groups, and the problem of assimilating, with which we have had more trouble than anything else.

Now, also I have been asked to report by certain groups—and the most recent report was when one of the members of the board of education asked me to attend a meeting, and this meeting was made up of groups, possibly 15, including CIO, A. F. of L., and civil liberties' groups, and a number of others; and these groups formed and now in this last meeting, the directors attempted to take over the power to influence the board of education. That is one of our specific problems, the groups pressuring to get power.

Consequently the other groups have formed to study these problems and try to do something to counteract the influence of the pressure groups that pressure for what they want, like FEPC, and whatever it is. So it is not that maybe we want to do it, but we feel that we want to have America pretty much as America was founded, and the principles upon which it stands. So we have taken like these groups here for good government, and we are studying these problems intelligently.

Senator WELKER. What happened, Mr. Chairman? There is confusion in the ranks. Is this witness testifying?

Senator WATKINS. She is testifying in a public hearing.

Senator WELKER. I did not know that she was testifying. We were over at the other place.

Senator WATKINS. They said that we could not have it. We had to move out.

Senator WELKER. We were there.

Senator WATKINS. We were told that we could not have it. We would have had to move out at 2 o'clock, so I asked Mr. Blair to find another place and notify people about it.

Mrs. TINKHAM. The type of immigration planned for in your Senate bill 1917 would bring to our country the people that we have up to now had to a certain extent trouble integrating into our American way of life, the Slavic group. I went to a meeting about a year ago and there was that feeling of pressure against something. They are born under a different government, and it is very hard for them to think in the American way of thinking, and many of them feel they are oppressed, and it gives them a sense of inferiority and therefore they feel that they have to put a front forward and get into groups to pressure for what they want.

So, strange as it may seem, one pressure group brings about another pressure group. One works on one side and one works on the other, and that we have very much of, as I have had recently, as in the board of education. We have had three members that we have just elected. The other side had what they called an SOS slate, and they pressured with certain groups, and there is one of our serious problems.

Senator WELKER. May I interrupt?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Where are you from?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Hollywood, Calif.

Senator WELKER. You are on the school board there?

Mrs. TINKHAM. No; but I am interested.

Senator WELKER. Do you represent only yourself, or do you represent a group?

Mrs. TINKHAM. No; I have organized certain good-government groups to study legislation.

Senator WELKER. How many people are in that good-government group?

Mrs. TINKHAM. In all the different places, like Santa Monica, Hollywood, Los Angeles, Studio City, Pasadena—

Senator WELKER. What is your total membership?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Well, I couldn't say. I have just talked last night to Laguna Beach. I couldn't say how many members they have altogether. They are all intensely interested in it.

Senator WELKER. Of course, the committee, I think, would like to know whether it is a group to represent 12 people or 12,000 people.

Mrs. TINKHAM. I can tell you that the Pleiades group, whom I speak for, has a group between 500 and 1,000.

Senator WELKER. Is that your club?

Mrs. TINKHAM. No; but the new president is one of my personal friends, and for 2 years was president of the Women's Breakfast Club, one of the outstanding clubs in the West.

Senator WELKER. My inquiry about that probably seems strange to you, but since I have been in this business I have found that people

come here and testify that they represent some high-sounding name of a club, and when you get to investigating, there might be 6 members or 60 members, in it. I merely wanted to inquire.

For your information, I am well acquainted with where you live. I practiced law there for a number of years.

Mrs. TINKHAM. I will say this about the Laguna Beach Group.

Senator WELKER. You say that you are president of it?

Mrs. TINKHAM. No; each one has their own chairman of their group.

Senator WELKER. And you organize them?

Mrs. TINKHAM. And I am organizing, to be interested in legislation.

Senator WELKER. Very well. I am sorry to have interrupted you.

Mrs. TINKHAM. The Pleiades Club has a membership, I would say between 500 and 1,000 members, and they are intensely interested, and are going to be more interested in good speakers and speakers who are going to give us the principles for which America stands, which I think—and I think that these groups that I represent feel—that we want the spirit of America kept intact. That is the point. We want the dignity of the individual, number 1 point, which I, as a matter of fact, am very strong for that, for our American principles.

Senator WELKER. What does the dignity of the individual have to do with this bill?

Mrs. TINKHAM. That is the very point that I am bringing out here—the point of assimilation, and that is the first point that I brought out here, that in order to live together and live happily we have to be well integrated individuals, and I am sure you will agree to that.

Senator WELKER. I have the reputation of being vigorously opposed to the bill, but I will ask you if it is not a fact that we all came from foreign stock some time or other; that we integrated here at one time or another?

Mrs. TINKHAM. I made one point of the Slavic groups, that they have more sense of banding together; there are certain groups of people that band together and have more of that than some of European immigration.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Pardon the interruption. I want to hear your testimony, but I wanted to clarify that.

Mrs. TINKHAM. That is all right. I am perfectly willing.

Now, in regard to jobs, in this bill it states that no one will be displaced, that they will have a job for everyone. What we find at present in our locality is the fact that people are displaced from jobs, Americans are displaced. We have the studios there, for instance, and in the studios, many an American has been displaced already, and that is up till now, and someone else has taken the job.

Senator WELKER. That has been going on since 1940, has it not?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Around that time.

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, there are many people at some of the major studios who can hardly speak the English language.

Mrs. TINKHAM. That is absolutely correct.

Senator WELKER. And they relieved people who have been in the industry for years and years?

Mrs. TINKHAM. That is correct. That is what I am saying. I am making a point. I think we are all idealistic—I am sure I am, be-

cause I have been interested in civic projects for a long time. I was on the last project, proposition B, to put in a music auditorium in fact I chairmanned the Hollywood committee for it. It was to spend \$27,000,000, and I am a taxpayer, and was willing to do it. It didn't pass, but I worked for it.

Senator WELKER. Are you a married person?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Yes; I have two children.

Senator WELKER. What does your husband do?

Mrs. TINKHAM. I have no husband at present.

Senator WELKER. I see.

Mrs. TINKHAM. But my one boy is a writer for one of the big papers in Los Angeles, a sportswriter.

Senator WELKER. What paper?

Mrs. TINKHAM. The Mirror.

Senator WELKER. What is his name?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Harley Tinkham. He was on my committee to put in the music auditorium, and something similar to the sports arena in New York City.

Senator WELKER. Let us get on.

Mr. ARENS. Are you sent here by these various organizations or do you come on your own. It would be helpful if you would say how you came here.

Mrs. TINKHAM. It was suggested in our Women's Breakfast Club 2 months ago that someone be sent to Washington. The man said "Your group is positively the most outstanding women's group in Los Angeles. The Women's Breakfast Club", and he said "I think that you should send somebody to Washington to find out what is going on right there, not what is in the newspapers, to talk to the persons involved in the situation, so that you get the human relations as well as the facts." So that was an inspiration, and I was there that afternoon, and at least 50 people said that I was the one that should come.

Senator WATKINS. Did the organization authorize you to come?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Not officially, because the next meeting was induction of officers to the club, but the first of the year they are going to take up this. In fact, I am trying to get every women's organization there interested in legislation, and, in fact, just before I left, one of the most prominent members of the Republican Club said, "I think we should have a committee on legislation in our Republican Assembly, and I think you should chairman it."

Senator WELKER. I would like to hear what you have to say about this bill, not what you have to say about other legislation.

Mrs. TINKHAM. I will be happy to. This is the first point I made in regard to the type of immigration. This is the No. 1 point.

I personally feel that a coordinator, placed at the head of this by someone, I would not feel—

Senator WELKER. From what are you reading?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Page 5.

The Coordinator may exercise any power, function, or authority conferred upon him by this act through such agencies, officers, or employees.

Senator WELKER. That is the old bill, is it not?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Is it the old bill?

Mr. ARENS. It might help you, Madam, if you would permit me to interpose this comment: that that particular section which you are reading has been drastically revised.

Mrs. TINKHAM. May I have the new section to see it?

Senator WELKER. This is the confidential committee print [document handed to the witness].

Senator WATKINS. You may comment on it.

Mrs. TINKHAM. This is confidential?

Senator WELKER. It is called that.

Senator WATKINS. It was confidential at one time, but it has long since ceased to be confidential.

Mrs. TINKHAM (reading):

The Coordinator may exercise any power—

Senator WELKER. From what are you reading?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Page 5.

Senator WELKER. That is still not the bill. There are lines in the bill to show the revisions.

Mrs. TINKHAM. This is the one that was given to me by Senator Jenner's office when I came here.

Senator WATKINS. That was the first one introduced. You may comment on both, if you wish.

Mrs. TINKHAM. I would be very happy to. You have just handed me this.

Senator WELKER. You understand that where you have lines drawn, the bill has been revised, and where you do not have any lines drawn through, that is the suggested bill. Am I correct?

Senator WATKINS. That is correct.

Senator WELKER. So it would start at page 12, madam, under the word "Definition."

Mr. ARENS. To be helpful to you, lady, I want to suggest that you might go on to your next point, because, irrespective of what your point on that particular subject is, it is moot, because that section has been completely changed.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Is this stricken, or is page 12, under "Loans" part of it?

Senator WATKINS. That is one of the proposals that will be brought before the committee. It has been there for study only and will probably be introduced as a proposal to put into the bill instead of the original language.

The new proposal is found where the lines are not drawn through.

Mrs. TINKHAM. This is one too, under loans, isn't it?

Senator WATKINS. The new proposal starts here.

Mr. ARENS. Why do you not pretend that it is a new bill beginning on page 12, line 21?

Mrs. TINKHAM. I am taking just what was given to me.

Mr. ARENS. You did not have this copy of it. We are not at all critical of you for not having it.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Nobody is criticizing anyone. I am a math major and everything is objective. I am a Christian, too, and I have nothing against anyone.

Does it still mean that the same types of people are to come in as under this?

Senator WATKINS. It is substantially the same, except that there are some additions and some further tests to be taken on them.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Do you mind telling me what the further tests are? I would like to take it down.

Senator WATKINS. They have to affirmatively establish that they are eligible, and the final determination is with the consular agent. He has to be entirely satisfied and the immigration officers have to be entirely satisfied. That is one point.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Does it have anything to do with the State Department?

Senator WATKINS. Well, yes. Of course, the consular service is under the State Department. Certainly.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Now, that point I am concerned about, because it so happened that in 1950 I was here and in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department.

Senator WATKINS. If you would, will you please tell us what your objections are to the bill?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Are you still for the proposition of loaning money to these people?

Senator WATKINS. Yes; we make loans to these people for transportation.

Mrs. TINKHAM. We have not actually made the bill yet, Mr. Watkins, have we?

Senator WATKINS. It has not passed yet. It is still in committee.

Mrs. TINKHAM. If it passes, we will?

Senator WATKINS. We have to help them.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Thank you very much. Your salesmanship is wonderful, because I am a salesman too, but we haven't passed the bill.

Senator WATKINS. That is obvious, because we are holding hearings on it.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Now, under the recent law, do we loan them money to come in? As I understand it, they have to be sponsored by some person here?

Senator WATKINS. That is under the 1952 Immigration Act. They still have to have someone if they do not have means. Mr. Arens is the expert on that. He will answer your question.

Mr. ARENS. May I respectfully suggest that it might be helpful to the lady to know that the point here is that this bill provides a loan of \$10 million.

Mrs. TINKHAM. And the new one is the same?

Mr. ARENS. The new one is substantially the same. The principle is the same.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Is there any difference in the two, so that the point might be brought out?

Mr. ARENS. No consequential difference.

Mrs. TINKHAM. That point I am interested in. So, if you will give me more explanation on it, I will appreciate it.

Mr. ARENS. There is no consequential difference between the redraft of the bill on that point and what was in the bill when it first went in. Is that what you wanted to know?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Yes, that is right. Is it that their transportation is paid across the water?

Mr. ARENS. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. TINKHAM. And from the port of embarkation to the relocation in the United States?

Mr. ARENS. That is right.

Mrs. TINKHAM. That I would be opposed to because, under the present system, they are sponsored to come over here, and I feel that that is right. I feel that there should be someone here that is interested enough in the person to sponsor them.

Mr. ARENS. Madam, I do not in any sense want to engage in a debate with you on the subject, but to point out something here.

Mrs. TINKHAM. I want to make my point. You do not have to agree, naturally.

Mr. ARENS. May I, in a very kindly manner, point out something to you that I think you ought to bear in mind when you say that under the present law they are sponsored by people?

Mrs. TINKHAM. I am sorry; I was saying it was my understanding. Senator WELKER. He will clarify it for you.

Mr. ARENS. Under this bill here no one is admissible unless someone in the United States, in effect, petitions for him and says, "I will give an assurance that he will have a job and a house without displacing someone." I am just trying to tell you what is in the bill.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Does he furnish the money for him to come?

Mr. ARENS. No; that is paid from the taxpayers, on the basis of the loan to the voluntary unit.

Senator WATKINS. You go right ahead and tell us your reasons why you are either for or against this bill.

Mrs. TINKHAM. I would not like the idea of a coordinator appointed by the President, and I will read it as it is in this, and we will see if you have it changed:

The Coordinator may exercise any power, function, or authority conferred on him by this Act through such agencies, officers, or employees of the United States as shall designate—

Mr. ARENS. That is the provision that we suggest has been taken out of the bill.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Completely out?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mrs. TINKHAM. There is no coordinator now?

Mr. ARENS. There is a coordinator.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Then will you tell me what powers he will have.

Mr. ARENS. I do not mean to be at all rude, but I think at this time to try to give you a complete explanation of the bill would be difficult.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Have you completely rewritten it?

Senator WATKINS. We have not completely rewritten it.

Senator WELKER. Page 17 has to do with the coordinator.

Mr. TINKHAM. Does he have authority?

Mr. ARENS. Let me point out what the revised draft of the bill does.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Different from what this is.

Mr. ARENS. May I make this overall statement; if the chairman please, and then tell you what the bill does.

The policy prescribed in the bill that you read and the policy prescribed in the revised draft are for all practical purposes the same.

The revised draft is a draft in which there are certain changes in procedures, and certain standards and technical changes, but the policy is substantially the same, for all practical purposes.

Mrs. TINKHAM. He is still given the power and authority?

Mr. ARENS. I am getting to that, if you please, madam.

The Coordinator, under the revised draft has the duties in general. He would arrange for the shipping of people from abroad; he would

arrange for the procurement from people in the United States of assurances for the individuals overseas; he would have miscellaneous duties of that character. The actual processing of the applicants under the act to determine their eligibility would be the duty of the consular service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mrs. TIMKINS. Then—

Mr. ARENS. Do you have another point?

Mrs. TINKHAM. The \$17,500, is that the the same under the new one?

Senator WELKER. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. TINKHAM (reading) :

Shall receive a rate of compensation not to exceed * * *.

Senator WELKER. You mean the rate of salary?

Mrs. TINKHAM. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Per year.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Per month or per year?

Senator WELKER. Per annum.

Mrs. TINKHAM. It doesn't say it in mine.

Senator WATKINS. You say that it does not say "per annum"?

Mrs. TINKHAM. It does not, and according to a real-estate contract, time is of the essence. This says "shall receive a rate of compensation not in excess of \$17,500."

Mr. ARENS. Well, the bill as it is now revised, madam, page 17, line 8, says "not in excess of \$17,500 per annum," which I might interpose here is considerably in excess of what the United States Senators receive.

Mrs. TINKHAM. The United States Senators are elected and this man is appointed, and I am not for that.

Mr. ARENS. That was a facetious comment.

Mrs. TINKHAM. That would be a political appointment, and I feel that way.

Senator WELKER. Do you have any suggestions to the committee as to how you would get a Coordinator?

Mrs. TINKHAM. I would like personally to leave the bill as the McCarran-Walter Act, which was passed last year in the Democratic administration, over the veto of the President, by a two-thirds majority of the House and Senate. And with that I will conclude, because I have to go to another meeting.

Thank you very much.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ERNEST W. HOWARD, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Senator WATKINS. Will you give us your name and address and your occupation, if any? If you represent any group or individuals, we would be glad to know that.

Mrs. HOWARD. I am Mrs. Ernest W. Howard. I am a voter of the State of Missouri, and a resident of Washington for a good many years, too.

I am here today representing the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, with a membership of 6,100. The District federation is affiliated with the General Federation of Women's Clubs, with a voting strength of between 750,000 and 800,000.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have any credentials from the organization?

Mrs. HOWARD. From the District federation?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Mrs. HOWARD. Simply my word, as I have been sent here.

Senator WATKINS. Are you an official?

Mrs. HOWARD. I am department chairman of public affairs under which this legislation comes.

Senator WELKER. And you are president of the District of Columbia club, are you not?

Mrs. HOWARD. No, not the president. I am department chairman of the District federation, of public affairs, and legislation is within my department. I am vice chairman of the legislation division, too.

Senator WATKINS. I wanted to ask this question: Do you have a resolution or anything from the organization, authorizing you to appear, and, if you do, I would like to put it into the record.

Mrs. HOWARD. We don't authorize. I don't have a written one, except that I am authorized by the federation at its last meeting, which was the fourth Monday of June, and we recessed for the summer, that we would work on this particular bill, so I am here to do that, to express our opposition to the bill and to the bringing in of the 240,000 refugees.

I would like to add, I said before, in qualifying myself, that the District federation is an affiliate of the General Federation and at its convention, of which I was a duly bona fide delegate to the General Federation's convention this May, the General Federation at its convention also opposed the bringing of the refugees and this clipping shows:

Clubwomen reject plea for refugees.

I might say, too, that I am an active member of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I am national chairman. I will simply state these to let you know that I am not here as a lone wolf. I am national public relations chairman for the United Daughters of the Confederacy, which will hold a convention here in November.

I am president-elect of the police and fire unit of the American Legion Auxiliary. I am president of the Women's Auxiliary to the International Association of Fire Fighters, and that is why I am a little late getting here.

Senator WELKER. Fire fighters?

Mrs. HOWARD. International Association of Fire Fighters.

Senator WELKER. Do they want you to testify today?

Mrs. HOWARD. I am qualifying myself.

Senator WELKER. I have had you before me to testify many times, and I thought you were representing the fire fighters.

Mrs. HOWARD. No; I am representing the auxiliary.

Senator WELKER. Yes; I know you very well.

Mrs. HOWARD. Also in Minneapolis I was elected as the eighth vice president of the American Federations of the Womens' Auxiliaries of Labor, of which Mrs. Ann Kelsey of Salt Lake City is president.

I am not speaking for those organizations, but I want to give you that to qualify myself with a certain background.

I might say, too, as you know, that the American Legion, as I understand it, is against this, too.

Senator WELKER. Are you a member of the auxiliary?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes. I told you I am president-elect of the police and fire unit.

Senator WELKER. The police and fire unit?

Mrs. HOWARD. Of the American Legion Auxiliary, the only one of its kind in the country. And I have been chairman of the legislation of the District department seven different times.

Now, we feel in taking this up about the refugees, and, of course, the Coordinator, I am not going into the technicalities of the bill, because we don't go into that because that can be changed so many times, and sort of trip us up later but we have definite reasons of why we are against this, and we know that going back to 476 A. D. that marked the downfall of the Roman Empire, and it was only after a slow infiltration of aliens.

And we know that even a nation—and these are some of the salient points that are brought up in our organizations—even a nation weakened by internal degeneracy may postpone its own downfall, and we feel with conditions as they are in the world, that is really a conquest by immigration, and we need more effective deportation administration and not more immigration.

We feel that the eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty but is also an essential of effective immigration control.

History shows that in the development of immigration policy in America, several basic attitudes have held: One, the door has always been opened wide; 2, the country has never anticipated danger, but always waits until injury is pressing and then legislates against further injury. Conditions seem to affect the American, conditions, and not principle, to determine. We have always been too bighearted and the Nation has never exercised its full and sovereign rights in holding the immigration stream in its own interest. We have always been negligent in enforcing our own deportation laws, which brings us to sluggish restriction instead of active selection.

Now, the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in its report of the special committee on immigration and naturalization in 1939, said:

Since man became a social being he has known that invaders, whether peaceful immigrants or conquering armies, which settle upon the land, become the inheritors thereof, and subsequently give character to the racial construction and to the social and cultural institutions of the country invaded in such proportion as their descendants reproduce in numbers, compared with the total population. Successful self-government of a country demands the maintenance of the successful population policy.

We know that years ago that we settled, that old saw about all of us being descendants, and, of course, we know that, but today we know that as the descendants, they are the proudest people of the land, and they think as we do that we should be very careful about infiltrating this country.

Now, in the general federation, the resolution that was voted down says that the President has requested emergency legislation regarding acceptance of additional refugees, where certain European countries are suffering from population surpluses which hinder economic and political stability in Western Europe and whereas the United States has been short of workers in certain fields, be it resolved that we support President Eisenhower's recommendations in the next 2 years, to help supplement our manpower shortages, re-

unite families, and at the same time strengthen objectives of the United States' foreign policy.

In the first place, who says there is a shortage of labor? And another thing we have to consider at this time, when there is an economic weakness and we are liable to have a period of economic depression and unemployment, that this is an excellent time for an immigrant receiving country like the United States to take stock of its past American immigration policies. There could very well be a chance to bring in and fill this country with extra people when we may very well need all the jobs that are going to come. We hope not, but then, too, it could be another way to lower wages, because these people come in and they will take a job at a much lower wage than our own people.

Then, we know, too, that it is not an emergency. For instance, here is a book on the immigration problem by Washington and Lee University, a professor there, and one at New York University.

This is 1922 and here, under the "Attitude of European Governments Toward Immigration" it says:

Recently an Italian Premier said that it was necessary for Italy to emigrate each year some 300,000 Italians, in order to relieve pressure at home.

so you see it was not an emergency because we are doing that in 1922, and I might say we have no thought about any one group. It doesn't make any difference whether they are Italians or Germans, or anything, because all those people have different ideas, their religious affiliations and so forth. And, of course, the idea was to get this bill through before the Italian elections, which would have made no difference, because we would have had to bring them in anyhow, because they have no kind of birth control.

Senator WELKER. Do we have any kind of birth control here?

Mrs. HOWARD. No.

Senator WATKINS. As a matter of fact, the testimony before the committee shows that the birthrate is much higher in the United States.

Mrs. HOWARD. As I say; what I want to point out is that this is not an emergency, because here in 1922 this Italian Premier says that they would have 300,000 a year that they would have to emigrate in order to keep the population down.

Senator WELKER. How about the Koreans and Nationalist Chinese? How do you feel about them? If we grant quotas to the Italians and Greeks, the Germans and the like, do you feel that we should give some help to the Chinese?

Mrs. HOWARD. I feel that we will be discriminating. I think we will be definitely discriminating. I think if we are going to do this we ought to bring the Arabs in.

Senator WELKER. Do you think that the Arabs would come?

Mrs. HOWARD. I don't know whether they would or not. They have been chased out of their homes, and I think that we could very well bring them over here. I don't think that we should discriminate and I don't think that this is going to have anything to do with our foreign policy. I think all of that is out the window, because I think it shows that what we have been doing, which has been certainly more almost than any nation could ever do, we have been generous in every way. I don't think that anything we do along that line helps us out as far as our foreign policy is concerned. I think that has been definitely settled in the last week or so.

I want to bring this out, too: For instance, in our discussion in the general federation convention, these were all people from the States. I remember our own State president from Missouri. All these people came down to speak before this microphone and deplored the fact that even such a request would be made with our own boys, as was often brought out by different speakers, that we send them away on one shore and bring in the refugees on the other in order to take their places. Someone said, "Well, we need the doctors."

Senator WELKER. The doctors from where?

Mrs. HOWARD. Refugee doctors. We don't think that at all. We know that there have been certain cases where for years I can remember in legislative work even before the Second World War, that I used to attend many a hearing over here where people were trying to get doctors to come in as refugees and put them to work in our hospitals without going through the regular procedure, so that is an old story, too.

Senator WELKER. Is that in the bill, that we are going to bring in so many doctors?

Mrs. HOWARD. It was discussed on the federation floor.

Senator WELKER. I take it that it is your opinion that you do not believe in the inscription on the Statue of Liberty "Give us your tired and weary and open up our arms to oppressed people"?

Mrs. HOWARD. I think that is pretty but you have to be selective.

Senator WELKER. You think that you have to be selective?

Mrs. HOWARD. I think any government does. If they want to last. I think any sovereign nation has the right to select who should come in. Other countries do, Canada, England. In fact, Canada is very selective.

Senator WELKER. Russia is pretty selective.

Mrs. HOWARD. It is most selective. That is our trouble today. Everybody is trying to make out like they are coming from behind the Iron Curtain, and in all this thing we can be infiltrated with the very enemies that we are trying to overcome. I think we have no assurance. I would not feel that we had a guarantee at all that the Consular Service should be the one who would say who these people are. I think that in the selection and screening—

Senator WATKINS. Whom would you have make the decision after they come up?

Mrs. HOWARD. Well, I think we should let the Federal Bureau of Investigation be in on it. I certainly would never trust the Consular Service under the last 20 years in the State Department, because the State Department itself needs some screening.

Senator WELKER. You are getting pretty close to the police state, are you not, if you use the FBI?

Mrs. HOWARD. I think you have to be careful who comes in, just as in our homes.

Senator WELKER. As I understand, they are going to be carefully screened.

Mrs. HOWARD. But by whom?

Senator WELKER. I think, Mrs Howard, that you know my attitude on the bill. I have asked some pretty searching questions, but I know your ability and have had you before me on several subcommittees, and I wanted to get your advice on this matter.

Mrs. HOWARD. Well, as you know, for the past—I don't know how long, time goes so fast and everything is so interesting, and you don't have time to really put dates down, but everything we have done in the last 2 months, and maybe even the last 2 years, we have to do because somebody over there won't like it. If you turn the corner, unless you cut it square, somebody over there will think we are not the people we are supposed to be. We have been in such an apologetic state in the past 2 years that we are even becoming clumsy, and we don't have to apologize here, our country has always been generous. It has been generous in receiving the poor and the refugees and uniting of families. It has been generous in its money. It has been generous until it has almost harmed itself. And everything we have done we have had to apologize for and it's just like the wolf cry, don't you know. You cry "Wolf" and finally nobody will pay attention. We have had to give money; if we don't do it this will be ruining our foreign policy, and we have to prove to those people that we are thus and so. Everything we have done we have to do it because we have to prove to them. That is ridiculous.

Has anything we have done made us any friends? Of all the generosity that we have given out we are no better off today. We haven't won the war in Korea. In fact, a little old man has about put it over on us, and so the last thing we have got is to bring these 240,000 in.

Senator WELKER. Now, speaking of this little old man of whom you referred, suppose he did not have anything to say at all; you would not say we won the war?

Mrs. HOWARD. We have been licked for the first time in this country; we have lost a war for the first time in the history of this Nation.

Mr. ARENS. Is that Syngman Rhee?

Senator WELKER. I think so.

I am interested in your discourse on where these jobs are going to come from. In my State we have many people unemployed. I talked to Senator Martin the other day and he said they have 100,000 people whom they would like to have employed in Pennsylvania. Have you made a study of where the jobs are coming from?

Mrs. HOWARD. We have children in the Ozark Mountains in Missouri who do not have shoes. We have children in Southern and Western States. We have plenty of people that we could give a great deal of this to. Now we are losing jobs. We have people who are losing their jobs in Government, and they will have to be re-placed.

As I pointed out before, so much legislation is like if you have ever gone out flower hunting, years and years ago, as we used to do, and you go out and see this pretty log. It looked like you could sit on it and if you lifted it up you would find worms under it.

So much of this legislation, we don't know after it is passed quite what might come of it.

Who says that we need any extra labor? Has labor told you that they are short?

Senator WATKINS. Let me answer your question. Mr. Durkin says that we do. He is the Secretary of Labor. He made that statement when we held the first hearings.

Senator WELKER. I can give him 5,000 up at Coeur d'Alene in my State.

Mrs. HOWARD. Did he tell you where we needed them? You have to explore that. That is where the worms come in.

Senator WATKINS. If I remember correctly, he did name categories.

Senator WELKER. They especially named farmers, I think. We had an experience with farmers in the 1948 Displaced Persons Act. Most of them stayed in my State long enough to change their shoes.

Mrs. HOWARD. We have had experience, and I know of actual experiences, we have had women in our district federation who have had the same experience, Senator Welker. They brought people over here thinking they were farmers, and they were no more a farmer than I was because, as you say, they stayed long enough to get their feet on the ground and then they went into the professions. We know they are not farmers; it is just a way of getting over here. There are so many things that you have to go into. This business of creating colonies.

I think the serious thing today, I think the thing that comes to me after all these other arguments are thought about is: Have we become so interested by foreign elements that this thing has to go through? I mean, we are not naive. I can come here and profess to be naive. I don't know very much, but I am not naive, and we do know that there is entirely too much of this colonization; for instance, north of the Mississippi, and Ohio and Potomac, we have these people come in and they colonize, and we know that it could very easily be the kind, and I won't tell you what I think. Is this becoming a political expediency, and, if so, that is a horrible thought, because, if it is, and if it is such an emergency, it makes us think that already we are lost, under the influence of foreign votes.

Now, people that come over here should become as Theodore Roosevelt and other great persons have said, Americans, not hyphenated, and they should vote for the man, and not whether he is an Italian or a German or French or anything else.

I might point out that Germany itself, that is why it was such a strong nation always, even afterward, because it was very careful of the infiltration of other people. So I think we have to think about that and whether we have gone so far that we are thinking in terms of "We have to get this thing through in order, before the next election, that we will get votes in this part of the country."

Senator WELKER. There is nothing in the bill about that.

Mrs. HOWARD. No; you wouldn't put that in the bill. You know how things are understood.

Senator WELKER. Let me ask you a question. You come from a farming State, and this has given me a great deal of concern.

Paragraph No. 1 on page 23 of the bill says:

Persons who are farmworkers and who are to be engaged as farmworkers in the United States, in areas in which there is a need for farmworkers, as certified by the United States Department of Labor to the Coordinator.

Now, in my State we need seasonal workers, many of them. We have to get Mexican labor to do the work in the fields, and grow crops and the like. I want to ask you, based upon your intensive study of this matter and other legislative matters: What are we going to do with these people as soon as we get the sugar beets on the railroad track and shipped, and there is no farm work to do in Idaho or Missouri?

Mrs. HOWARD. You are going to have to shoo them out of your part of the country or hold the bag with them, or create other jobs. That is a problem that you are just adding to the one, the worst one that you are going to have, if you bring all these people over. You should not

bring them into your part of the country unless you are prepared to do something about it. That is the migration. That gets the people on the march and creates a terrible situation.

I say I don't think there should be any problems in our country. I think first we should solve our own problems, as far as our own people are concerned. I am not an isolationist except in this way. I think that our own people should be cared for along with all the great humanitarian spirit that we have for other people.

Senator WELKER. Now, the No. 1 priority here are people who are farm workers, who are to be engaged as farm workers in the United States. I want to ask you as a Missourian, what are you going to do after the farm work is done?

Mrs. HOWARD. If they come to your State?

Senator WELKER. You are going to need them to put up the hay.

Mrs. HOWARD. It doesn't take long to put in the hay.

Mr. ARENS. She is from the District of Columbia.

Mrs. HOWARD. I might say I am a refugee myself, from the Democratic Party.

Senator WELKER. She is from Missouri.

Senator WATKINS. You say that you are a refugee?

Mrs. HOWARD. I was this time. A refugee from the Democratic Party.

Senator WELKER. When did you come to the District?

Mrs. HOWARD. In 1919. My home is still out there. I am like the Congressmen—I go back and forth.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Arens is also from Missouri. You are an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor?

Mrs. HOWARD. I am not speaking for that organization today.

Senator WELKER. When you say you do not have much trust in the United States Department of Labor—

Mrs. HOWARD. I didn't say I didn't have trust in the Department of Labor.

Senator WELKER. In substance you did. You said there was not need of labor.

Mrs. HOWARD. I believe I said "Who said there was a shortage of labor?" And the chairman said "The Department of Labor."

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Durkin, I believe, told us that we could use some well-selected labor.

Mrs. HOWARD. Then I asked him where is the shortage, if I recall—and I never received an answer. I am wondering where the shortage is, if we need people.

Senator WELKER. I am wondering that, too.

Senator WATKINS. I will tell you where one shortage is, and probably no one would want to go there unless he was trained. They have a shortage of shepherders.

Senator WELKER. I would not object to sending these people out to herd sheep.

Mrs. HOWARD. I expect we have gotten so soft in this country that you couldn't find people with that much energy.

Senator WELKER. It does not take energy.

Mr. ARENS. You come from a great State.

Mrs. HOWARD. I know I do, but I am not speaking for labor.

Senator WATKINS. As I understand it, you do not have any resolution of any kind?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes; we oppose it. The District Federation of Women's Clubs, when this came up—we don't want a Coordinator, by the way, under whom it will end up by saying, "under a Coordinator"—we are afraid of a Coordinator. We don't think you need it with our other departments taking care of immigration. It might very well make immigration a definite political setup.

Mr. ARENS. Madam, do you not think it would be helpful to have a kind of Coordinator of all the immigration activities, at least of the Government, worldwide?

You know, I am sure, on the basis of your study, that at the present time we have numerous governmental and intergovernmental agencies now spending money all over the world for refugees.

Mrs. HOWARD. Too numerous.

Mr. ARENS. Should there not be one office that centralizes that activity?

Mrs. HOWARD. When you say "all over the world," would our Coordinator have charge of all over the world? He shouldn't. He wouldn't have any business.

Mr. ARENS. United States money is spent all over the world.

Mrs. HOWARD. A Coordinator from the United States. He should look out for the United States. We might have a man at that end of the lane and one here, too, but when you say "the world"—

Mr. ARENS. Should he not look after the money that we are spending all over the world? We have in Central Europe alone about 10 governmental or intergovernmental agencies now spending taxpayers' money.

Mrs. HOWARD. Is he going to look after the spending of the money or after the immigrants?

Mr. ARENS. Do you not think we ought to have a Coordinator, at least in this field?

Senator WATKINS. We already have a bill that has passed the Senate, in which we provide for a commissioner of refugees, taking care of all our territory throughout the world in the field of refugees, and one man will have the say-so and we will not have 10 organizations in Europe alone.

Mrs. HOWARD. That is the same.

Senator WATKINS. No; this one is the manager of transportation. He looks after having them checked; who wants to sponsor these people from over there; who are willing to certify and I assume, to give bond that they will be taken care of when they get here.

Mrs. HOWARD. This is a question I would like to ask—

Senator WELKER. Before you ask that question, is it not a fair assumption, Mrs. Howard, that you would be in favor of a Coordinator to deport many people over here?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes, we could use a couple of Coordinators.

Senator WATKINS. We happen to have an immigration service that is supposed to do the job.

Mrs. HOWARD. I know, but you see, we have so many loopholes, Mr. Chairman. It is just like in our laws, in our courts. We know we are American, and we have to be careful, we have to be elastic, so that an innocent person won't get hurt or something like that. On the other hand, our laws are so technical that the worst criminal or the person that should be deported the most can get in under it.

Mr. ARENS. Can you point out some of those loopholes in the Immigration Act?

Mrs. HOWARD. I couldn't do that.

Mr. ARENS. I thought that you might help.

Mrs. HOWARD. Under these circumstances, I don't know that I would be prepared to do it now. I might at another time.

Mr. ARENS. Could you point out some of those loopholes under the new Immigration and Nationality Act?

Mrs. HOWARD. What we need is a strong Deportation Department and follow through, not pick up someone today and all of a sudden let him loose somewhere and you never hear of him again.

Senator WELKER. I take it that you have read the passage in this book:

What moral right has a nation with a low economic standard and rapidly increasing population to impose its surplus upon more favorably situated countries, wherein a more reasonable birthrate prevails.

I take it that you believe in that?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes, and another thing we have to look at is about the banks. You see, it is a very serious problem, this bringing them in. Sometimes they come over here and make this money and in the meantime send it back and while we are glad they can send money back, on the other hand, this country loses it. I am not prepared to back it up, but we are making a study of it.

Senator WATKINS. Would you object to them sending a little money when we send so much of the taxpayers' money?

Mrs. HOWARD. I would like for them to take it. I think today that we have to look into the fact that there are too many people interested in bringing people into this country.

Senator WELKER. Who are these people who are interested?

Mrs. HOWARD. I am wondering, is there money in bringing them in? Is there money to certain lawyers?

Senator WATKINS. Can you throw any light on it?

Mrs. HOWARD. Not yet.

Senator WELKER. I do not know how the lawyers would help in the business.

Mrs. HOWARD. There might be money in bringing them in, just like there was in selling slaves, but there is something behind the tremendous pressure that is being brought upon this Congress and upon the President. Why do we have this tremendous pressure and, as I say, we can't blame him for wanting this done. I think the people—you see, the thing of it is that so many people in the States don't realize. I always say that if I stayed home and minded my own business that I wouldn't believe the things that I actually know, and I couldn't have someone come to me and say that these things exist because I would think—"Well, this is America, and these things can't happen; that she is either hysterical or not telling the truth," but the people don't know. They are not informed. And everything written up "We must bring these people. They are suffering." This has been since 1945. Where are these people coming from?

Mr. ARENS. What are some of these unbelievable things?

Mrs. HOWARD. Well, go in executive session.

Senator WATKINS. You say that the people are not informed. We have the press here, and they would be interested in finding out about these things.

Mrs. HOWARD. Our people in this country, we feel sorry for anybody, for the underdog, don't you see, and all you have to do is to say "These people are run across," and we have to bring them here and unite families. You know, there are ways and means of how they get together. You are not naive either.

Senator WATKINS. I am wondering.

Mrs. HOWARD. I know you do—you must sometimes. If this was such an emergency for these 240,000 people, if it is an emergency like your house is afire and you have to get out, how are you going to take time to have somebody sponsor them? You haven't time to figure that out.

Senator WELKER. That is a sound question. I would like for that to be answered.

Mrs. HOWARD. We want to know.

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask you this question: Do you believe in using the Voice of America to get the people behind the Iron Curtain dissatisfied?

Mrs. HOWARD. It is according to whose voice in America it is.

Senator WATKINS. Do you believe in it?

Mrs. HOWARD. No; because anybody with a grain of commonsense knows that there isn't anybody over there to listen except those that they want to listen.

Senator WATKINS. Could you verify that at all?

Mrs. HOWARD. Who listens to the Voice of America?

Senator WATKINS. I do not know. I have never been over there.

Mrs. HOWARD. It is like when you go over to inspect.

Senator WELKER. Do not look at me—I have never been out of the United States.

Mrs. HOWARD. When they have gone over to inspect, what do you see? What they want you to see.

Senator WATKINS. I am talking about behind the Iron Curtain. Your clubwomen never go there. No American goes there unless in the underground.

Mr. ARENS. I think she has a point. When we were over there this summer—and I have been there twice on congressional tours, we made a point not to go where the receptionists wanted us to go. We said, "That is fine—we also want to go on our own." The Senators are wise to that.

Mrs. HOWARD. They are getting on to it.

Mr. ARENS. I think so.

Mrs. HOWARD. I think the greatest memorial that could be made to the great Statesman—I am not sure but maybe the last speech that Senator Smith made was leaning over a chair in the other room, I believe, against bringing these refugees in.

Senator WELKER. You are referring to Senator Willis Smith?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes; and this morning I heard the memorial to him, and I was impressed by the fact of what Senator Wiley said; and, of course, Senator Wiley has become quite a one-worlder in his thoughts in the last couple of years, and I was tremendously impressed by the fact that the thought Senator Smith had a great judicial mind, and I was hoping, and jotting it down, that maybe not passing this bill would be one of the greatest memorials to him, because you cannot doubt his mind as a great lawyer and a great statesman. I am sure

that he had a great and generous heart, and I know all of you people have. I know Senator Watkins and all.

Senator WELKER. Do you think that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations and our departed colleague differed?

Mrs. HOWARD. Oh, my—you hear so much about the free world. Of course, this is not a place to ask, but I want to ask who is free, outside of this country? Because we are trying to help everybody get free.

Senator WATKINS. I take it that you do not believe in using the Voice of America to urge them to leave?

Mrs. HOWARD. I don't think anybody that should hear the Voice of America hears the Voice of America.

Senator WATKINS. If it could be heard, would you think that would be a good thing to do? Do you agree that it would be a good thing to do it?

Mrs. HOWARD. I only have to go back to say that if it is the right voice. We haven't cleaned it up.

Senator WATKINS. You mean that the Voice of America—

Mrs. HOWARD. I don't know what is going out over the Voice of America. I would want to see what is going out, because material has been going out that shouldn't go out.

Senator WATKINS. You could find out. They have scripts there.

Mrs. HOWARD. You would be surprised how hard it is to find out. Have you ever tried to find out what happened in the State Department, outside of being a Senator, and tried to do it?

Senator WELKER. I take it that it is your conclusion that you do not need the Voice of America asking people to come here and put Americans out of work?

Mrs. HOWARD. I don't think the person who is in the class of a refugee and is fleeing from the Iron Curtain or from poverty or anything else, I don't think they need to know what style ladies' handbags we have over here, and I know that went out. I don't think I would be interested in the handbags if I was fleeing from an Iron Curtain country. I would be more interested in a lunch box, especially if it came from the Middle West.

Senator WELKER. We had a great depression in the early thirties. Do you recall where our people fled?

Mrs. HOWARD. They didn't do much fleeing.

Senator WELKER. They did not have any place to go.

Mrs. HOWARD. We don't flee in America. We face it. That is what these people should have done.

Mr. ARENS. Are you also with the National Federation of Women's Clubs?

Senator WELKER. She is not appearing for them.

Mrs. HOWARD. We are affiliated with the general convention. The general convention is made up of clubs which our District of Columbia Federation and our States are affiliated with, and my two individual clubs are directly affiliated. I am not speaking for the general federation here.

Mr. ARENS. Is Mrs. Wright chairman of the nationwide group?

Mrs. HOWARD. She hasn't been since 1952.

Senator WATKINS. She was the counsel?

Mrs. HOWARD. She was the legislative chairman, but not since 1952.

Mr. ARENS. Did I understand you to say that the National Federation of Women's Clubs passed a resolution?

Mrs. HOWARD. The general federation met here the last week of May, and this resolution was brought up—and I don't want to be quoted. I am only representing today the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, of which we are a part of the general, and I went as a bona fide director, voting delegate, to the general Federation, and this resolution came up there requesting, urging the bringing in of these refugees, because the President had requested it as emergency legislation, but the general federation in convention opposed bringing in the refugees.

Mr. ARENS. I did not understand that.

Mrs. HOWARD. "Women reject plea for refugees."

Senator WELKER (presiding). It was a close vote, was it not?

Mrs. HOWARD. It was a close vote. There weren't many there, but the close vote was finally taken after three different tries at it. I think if they counted it the first time it would have been close.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever discussed this matter in the International Association of the Auxiliary of Fire Fighters?

Mrs. HOWARD. Not yet, but they are clubwomen, too, and our auxiliary is affiliated with the general and district federation, and they are the same type of women and they believe that we don't want to infiltrate our country with refugees, other than in the regular way. They should come over in the regular way.

Mr. ARENS. Was your husband a fireman?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes; but I am not speaking for the International Fire Fighters Auxiliary today, because we have taken no action.

Senator WELKER. When do you meet again?

Mrs. HOWARD. We meet in Miami next year.

Senator WELKER. That will be too late for us to have the benefit of your help.

Mrs. HOWARD. How can you pass this, in view of the fact that the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, and the American Legion Auxiliary are against it?

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is against it.

Mr. ARENS. Did I understand you to say that you are also with the Women's Auxiliary of the American Legion?

Mrs. HOWARD. I am president-elect of the police and fire unit of the Department of the District of Columbia. I will go in this September, and I am also legislative chairman of the police and fire unit of the American Legion Auxiliary of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ARENS. Has the American Legion Auxiliary taken a position on this legislation?

Mrs. HOWARD. Our police and fire unit has, and you must remember, the American Legion itself initiates legislation. The American Legion Auxiliary does not initiate legislation, and the action of the American Legion is the action of the American Legion Auxiliary, and I am not speaking for them today except that I do know that the American Legion, at one of the hearings, had a representative here and, as I understand from Mr. Kennedy, the American Legion is opposed to bringing in the refugees.

Mr. ARENS. That is correct.

Have you made any study of this particular bill from the standpoint of the numbers that are not refugees that the bill brings in?

Mrs. HOWARD. Those are just numbers, so many of this and that.

Mr. ARENS. You understand, do you not, that about 112,000 of the 240,000 are not refugees?

Mrs. HOWARD. That goes for the same thing. Anybody that comes over is more or less a refugee, except under certain circumstances—that is a little broad—but just pick up that many people and dump them over here, no matter what they are, whether they are refugees running from something, or people that just want to get away.

Mr. ARENS. I am afraid I did not make my point here, but approximately half of the people are not in the refugee category.

Mrs. HOWARD. What are they?

Mr. ARENS. They are just nationals.

Mrs. HOWARD. What are they coming for?

Senator WELKER. I will tell you what a witness told me on the stand the other day. I asked him why he wanted his people to come over, and he said it was because we had better old-age pensions and social security. I take it that you do not agree with that.

Mrs. HOWARD. No. You read here—and I think it was in this book in 1939—where they begged to overhaul our immigration laws, and it was quite interesting to note that sometimes they got as far as Canada, and one fellow that came over, that night they had made contact with New York to put them on the relief rolls as soon as they crossed over.

Senator WELKER. To what book do you refer?

Mrs. HOWARD. It is in here [indicating].

Senator WELKER. That book is a little old. I was a sophomore in high school when that was written.

Mrs. HOWARD. Don't you know if you keep a thing long enough—in 1922 when this book was written the Italian Premier said that "We will have at least 300,000 a year as emigrants, in order to keep the population down," and here you want to bring in these to keep the population down—it is the same old story.

Senator WELKER. That is not the purpose of this bill, is it? I understood that this was a refugee bill.

Mrs. HOWARD. That is what I am telling you. You must pull up the log. Today's words that you see are propaganda and you have to know how to analyze words. You might say that that glass of water looks good and, on the other hand, when you analyze it you might be seeing something terrible.

Mr. ARENS. It might have poison in it.

Mrs. HOWARD. Don't take everything that you read to heart, before you analyze it.

Senator WELKER. I can assure you, Mrs. Howard, that I have not gone overboard for this bill, until I analyze it.

Mrs. HOWARD. Remember the day in the other room when this man dashed in and he wanted to hurry up and get this thing passed before the elections in Italy. I point that out as I wanted to point out, that it doesn't make any difference whether they are Italians or Germans, but do you remember, he brought out that there was such a shortage? Do you remember the pamphlets or booklets, very fine ones, that I sent to you marked, where they went on to say how fine conditions were and everything?

Senator WELKER. And you are referring to the witness who testified that we had to have this emergency legislation prior to the Italian elections?

Mrs. HOWARD. That should help you not pass the bill because nothing happened.

Senator WELKER. Then you also heard some testimony that it would help in the Bermuda conference?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes; but the Lord interfered there. We are not going to have a Bermuda conference.

Mr. ARENS. Does your group maintain an interest in the internal-security problems, Mrs. Howard?

Mrs. HOWARD. That is the thing we are interested in. We are interested in this because we are interested solely and entirely in the internal security of this country.

Mr. ARENS. I meant not internal security in the broadest sense, but from the standpoint of Communists. Does your group develop information?

Mrs. HOWARD. You can't cut across internal security. We are interested in everything that has to do with the internal security of this country, and we have a lot of holes in the dike.

Mr. ARENS. Has your group made a study of the relationship between the immigration system, as such, and the Communist conspiracy in this country?

Mrs. HOWARD. Oh, yes. We know all about that.

Mr. ARENS. There is an intimate relationship there.

Mrs. HOWARD. We know that out of the 240,000 to be brought in there could be 140,000 of them ready to take over one day when the switch was thrown. That is what happened in France. That is when they had their downfall.

Senator WELKER. You are speaking of the French Revolution?

Mrs. HOWARD. 1940, the fall of France. Bullitt testified before the House Judiciary Committee, I recall very well that he brought out at the time how that happened; the infiltration of these different people. They were all in their key positions. Everything looked wonderful. When the time came they were in position, ready to take over.

Senator WELKER. You mean when the Germans took over?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes. We have to be very careful, and we are not being careful. We are being bighearted, but we are not being careful.

Senator WELKER. I wonder if we are being so bighearted.

Mrs. HOWARD. What do you call it?

Senator WELKER. Suppose these people do not have jobs and they suffer when they come?

Mrs. HOWARD. Don't have jobs here?

Senator WELKER. I mean, when they get here, and find it is not so nice.

Mrs. HOWARD. We know they are not going to have jobs. Where are you going to bring 240,000 people?

Mr. ARENS. You know that this is in addition to the regular immigration, which runs about 200,000.

Mrs. HOWARD. I wonder to myself, is it another way to break down the McCarran Act? Don't answer that. I just wondered.

Mr. ARENS. I think it is all right if it is answered.

Mrs. HOWARD. I understand that I think there will be many ways—as I say, I don't think the President—he has the pressure. We feel that if the people would speak out—the people in other countries should realize that in our country people speak through their elected Senators and Congressmen, and we know that we have all these pressure groups. They go to the President and come to you people. We know what pressure groups are. You have a hard time getting them off of your backs. I feel that the President would be so grateful if the people would speak out and relieve the pressure from him.

Mr. ARENS. Do you not think that there is a crying need for an organization of the patriotic groups of the country?

Mrs. HOWARD. I am glad you mentioned that because now the Women's Patriotic Conference is a conference made up of 37 patriotic organizations, and they had last year a very strong—we don't speak for the conference, you understand—the organizations go back and speak individually, and the organization that I belong to, which was the Wheel of Progress, which is about 25 years old, is a patriotic organization.

Senator WELKER. What group does that represent?

Mrs. HOWARD. That is a patriotic group of men and women made up of judges and lawyers and patriotic women of high standing. We take it for granted most all of our American people are patriotic.

Senator WELKER. That is why I asked the question.

Mrs. HOWARD. We went on record, we wanted to close down immigration for a while because all of that was all right to bring in all those people when we were laying the tracks for the Pacific railroads, and all that, and now we have had to close up and other countries have progressed—or should have. I always feel that they should have taken some lessons from us in the 25-year interim where there was no war. There is no reason for any country in the world today to be so backward that they can't take care of their own people.

Senator WELKER. Mrs. Howard, what are we going to do with these people? What is civilization generally going to do? Now, you had a book here printed in 1922 that tells us that Italy alone had to have 300,000 people seek a haven in some other land. Now do you mean to say that we must close the door?

Mrs. HOWARD. Even a sponge, no matter how big it is, some day soaks up all the water it can hold.

Senator WELKER. What are we going to do when that sponge is filled?

Mrs. HOWARD. I don't think we should try to go too far ahead. I think that is presuming upon God Almighty. He says, you know, that we will always have the poor with us; we will always have war. We are knocking ourselves out trying to—there will always be war. Now we are getting afield, but you have, of course, my thought, that we should have an umbrella of planes all over this country, and a standing army on all four shores.

Senator WELKER. Let us save that for Senator Wiley.

Mr. ARENS. The Armed Services Committee.

Senator WELKER. Let us save that for Foreign Relations, and Armed Services. We do not have any jurisdiction to listen to foreign policy.

Mr. ARENS. I was wondering, Senator—she was describing these patriotic groups, and I do not think you completed that, did you, Mrs. Howard?

Mrs. HOWARD. I said we passed laws against the limitation of immigration, making a limit.

Mr. ARENS. Has your group made a study of the McCarran Immigration Nationality Act?

Mrs. HOWARD. Our District Federation of Women's Clubs went on record in April of 1952 endorsing the McCarran Act.

Mr. ARENS. And you are satisfied it is a sound piece of legislation?

Mrs. HOWARD. Definitely, we think it is. We think that after 4 years of the legal minds that studied it and brought out the McCarran Act, we think it was badly needed. It is a known fact all over that our immigration laws and regulations were loose, and we think it doesn't keep out anybody and the only people that are against it, I will just say, are those—the only people who are against it are people who have something to fear, or some idea in their minds which we don't know about yet.

Now, a good American could not be opposed, because it doesn't keep anybody out except the wrong people, anyhow. So there could be nothing wrong with the McCarran Act, and I think that the reason that the President vetoed the act at the time was because of pressure groups, which we have no business of having any of our legislators from the President down, having to listen to pressure groups.

Senator WELKER. Well, you are familiar with the appointment of Mr. Rosenfield and Mr. Pressman.

Mrs. HOWARD. You mean that Commission? That was a laugh. I attended some of it. That was packed. That was only window dressing. We attended it.

Senator WELKER. You say you attended it?

Mrs. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. You do not think that they were sincere?

Mrs. HOWARD. I think they thought it was a good idea to put on a window dressing just before election, or that sort of thing, but I was not impressed by very many of the people that were on it, and I was not impressed by the way that they heard the people who were for the McCarran Act.

Mr. ARENS. Were they discourteous to them?

Mrs. HOWARD. Not discourteous, but you know the old cold shoulder.

Mr. ARENS. What do you think of the recommendations of this Truman Commission. Have you studied those?

Mrs. HOWARD. I read them, but there was no point to studying them because I think, if you have been around a little you don't have to study them. You knew what it was going to be. You don't have to study a thing like that.

Mr. ARENS. You concluded in your mind that their recommendations were not sound?

Mrs. HOWARD. I think you knew what to look for immediately. You see, you kind of know what to look for. You go out to look for something and you know what to look for.

Mr. ARENS. Did you make a study of the displaced persons program when it was administered here some few years ago?

Mrs. HOWARD. We probably went into it at the time. I don't know what you are getting at.

Mr. ARENS. I wanted to know if you were satisfied with the way it was administered?

Mrs. HOWARD. Speaking personally, I haven't been dissatisfied with the way anything has been administered in the last 15 years.

Mr. ARENS. Do you mean "satisfied" or "dissatisfied"?

Mrs. HOWARD. I have not been satisfied with the way a great many things were administered in the last 15 years. That is why we had a change.

Mr. ARENS. I do not want to take you afield.

Mrs. HOWARD. I don't think we go far afield, because I think all of this is a tremendous plan.

Mr. ARENS. It is all related, you think?

Mrs. HOWARD. It is just a little bit more, just another link in the chain, and some day we are going to have it so long, it is going to hang us if we are not careful. I think this is adding to it. I think this would be a very weak link.

Mr. ARENS. Are you acquainted with the employment and housing prospects in this area?

Mrs. HOWARD. Oh, yes.

Mr. ARENS. What is your appraisal of that situation?

Mrs. HOWARD. I don't think we have enough. That is, of course, now, if you are talking about against bringing in all these other people. Don't you see that in our country no one expects everyone to have a house of their own. That is not supposed to be.

If we are going to do this for these other people, let's see that all of our own boys come back to a house of their own. I think it was so well put in one of the arguments against the refugee bill in the convention. Here we send our boys off this way on one shore and bring all these people in to take their place on the other.

Senator WELKER. We also bring in families and stepchildren and adopted children.

Mrs. HOWARD. That is right, and they do all sorts of tricks to get them.

Mr. ARENS. What kind of tricks?

Mrs. HOWARD. You had all the tricks. They will marry anything or anybody in order to go through that business to get in, and all that sort of thing, and they have grandmothers; just like a grandmother that died on baseball day. They have one for every day of the week. There are all sorts of tricks to get in.

We are either naive, or we know what we are doing.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with the situation on the Canadian border?

Mrs. HOWARD. They say there is many an eye winked there to get them in. Canada has rather a strong immigration law, regarding their own people. Of course, Canada can't stop up all the loose dikes there.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with the situation on the Mexican border?

Mrs. HOWARD. I understand something about it. I understand they get in that way, too. This book goes back to, I think, maybe 1820, and all about the first immigration law that was passed.

Mr. ARENS. I was just going to suggest that there is another book more recent than that.

In 1950, the Senate subcommittee came up with a voluminous report, Senate Report 1515.

Mrs. HOWARD. That was early, and how one of our regulations was to fine a ship captain so much a head if they brought one in.

Senator WELKER. The committee will be in recess. Thank you very much.

Mrs. HOWARD. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 2:40 p. m. the hearing was concluded.)

(Subsequent to the hearings the following communications and statements were ordered made a part of the record:)

STATEMENT OF WALTER J. MASON, MEMBER, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

The American Federation of Labor supports the purposes of S. 1917, which would authorize the immigration of an additional 240,000 persons from Europe during a period of 2 years. This legislation would make a fundamental contribution to the all-important struggle of the free world against Communist tyranny. Its enactment would give new hope and faith to the hundreds of thousands of refugees from Communist terror and enslavement.

The American Federation of Labor was one of the champions of the Displaced Persons Acts of 1949 and 1950, because we believed they were necessary to meet the emergency problems resulting from persecution by totalitarian regimes. In the light of experience under that legislation, we are convinced that our support of the displaced persons program was fully justified. Now we have a new problem and a new emergency—the problem of the millions of people who have fled into Western Europe from the Communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain. The bill which your committee is now considering will help to meet some of the problems which have resulted from this new emergency.

Since the war there has been a steady stream of refugees who have managed to break out from behind the Iron Curtain despite every means that their Communist rulers have adopted to prevent them from fleeing from Communist enslavement. Large numbers of individuals have, at the risk of their lives, escaped from Communist tyranny to gain freedom in Western Europe. But the presence of these large numbers of refugees in Western Europe has created serious problems in a number of areas which are already overburdened with a surplus population.

The American Federation of Labor recognizes that the United States cannot alone provide the answer to this serious problem. But this Nation does have a very important role to play. The displaced persons program constituted an important beginning in the effort to provide a solution to the problems of surplus population in Western Europe arising after the war. Other nations, especially Australia, Canada, and some of the South American countries, have made their contribution to a solution of this very difficult problem by admitting hundreds of thousands of immigrants from Western Europe. Since the war Canada and Australia have encouraged immigration and have each admitted about 800,000, while several hundred thousand additional persons have found a haven in South America.

But the problem is still with us, and there are still hundreds of thousands of escapees and expellees who have come into Western Europe from behind the Iron Curtain who cannot be absorbed into the already overburdened economy of the free nations of Western Europe. To their numbers, new thousands are being added all the time as additional people flee from Eastern Europe. Therefore it is essential that this legislation be enacted at this time in order for us to absorb into this country at least a fraction of this large group of people who, after having escaped into Western Europe, are unable to find a means of providing even a minimum level of living for themselves and their families.

I can assure the members of this committee that the American Federation of Labor would not recommend the enactment of this legislation if we thought that it would be harmful to the welfare of the people of the United States. We are convinced that this legislation would have no bad effects on our own country. On the contrary, while helping to achieve very desirable humanitarian goals, it will be of substantial benefit to our Nation.

The experience that we have had under the Displaced Persons Act fully supports that expectation. The immigrants who have come into this country under the displaced persons program have made a substantial contribution to America. We have every reason to believe that the admission of anti-Communist refugees as authorized under this legislation would also be of benefit to the United States.

There is no question that we can absorb into this country 240,000 persons whose admission would be authorized by this bill.

This bill establishes a special quota of 240,000 visas which may be, but is not required to be, distributed to refugees from certain specified key areas. These are the areas which have been hardest hit by problems of surplus population resulting from the migration of escapees and expellees from behind the Iron Curtain.

The bill would permit a maximum of 110,000 persons to be admitted who have escaped or been expelled from Eastern Europe and are now residing in the German Federal Republic, in the western sectors of Berlin, or in Austria. The story of the sacrifices which have been made by the thousands of individuals and families who have escaped from Eastern Germany, from the satellite countries, and even from Russia itself into Western Germany and the western sector of Berlin have become almost legendary. Since 1945, 10 million such persons have somehow managed to escape from Communist enslavement to freedom in Western Germany. In recent months 30,000 to 40,000 persons have been coming each month from behind the Iron Curtain into Western Germany. The presence of this very large number of refugees, whose ranks are being swelled each day, has created extremely serious economic problems in Western Germany. The admission of 110,000 refugees from Western Germany would help to alleviate the economic pressure of this swelling surplus of population on Western Germany. It would also provide an opportunity to obtain an adequate livelihood for the refugees who would come to our shores—an opportunity which, with the utmost good will and maximum effort, Western Germany simply cannot provide.

The bill would provide for admission of 75,000 Italian nationals or persons of Italian ethnic origin residing in Italy or in the free territory of Trieste. Italy faces an exceptionally serious problem of overpopulation. The high birthrate maintained in the past and the stopping of the historic flow of emigration during and after the war has resulted in a large increase in the Italian population. With a lower birthrate and some migration from the country, it is to be hoped that this problem will be solved in time. But at the present time there are over 2 million workers in Italy who are totally unemployed and an equal number of those employed only part time. The admission of 75,000 Italians would have at least some effect in mitigating this situation.

The bill also provides for admission of 20,000 persons from Greece where there is also a serious unemployment problem. This key country is weathering a serious economic crisis, with industrial unemployment alone more than doubling since January 1952. This problem has been aggravated by the attempt to absorb refugees who have sought refuge in Greece from the Communist satellite countries in the Balkan area.

The Netherlands, which was already faced with a critical problem of unemployment and surplus population, has now been beset with additional problems by the recent flood. The population problems of the Netherlands arose mainly after the war when many Dutch returned to the Netherlands from the East Indies. The establishment of the independent Republic of Indonesia also created special economic problems for the Netherlands which have been aggravated by the recent flood catastrophe. The bill provides for admission of 20,000 persons from the Netherlands to help relieve the resulting economic pressure.

In addition, the bill authorizes admission of 15,000 persons who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain countries and are now residing in the European NATO countries, or Turkey, or Trieste. Turkey has admitted over 200,000 refugees of Turkish origin from Communist Bulgaria who sought to escape Communist rule. In addition, they have provided refuge to non-Turkish escapees and expellees. In Trieste and in a number of NATO countries the inability to absorb the influx of nonnationals who have escaped from the Communist regimes has given rise to economic as well as political problems. We should certainly make at least a token effort to give refuge in our own country to a fraction of these refugees.

The American Federation of Labor recognizes the need to keep out of this country those who would attempt to undermine our democratic institutions. As desirable and necessary as it is to provide a haven for the refugees from Communist territory, it is also necessary that there be adequate safeguards in legislation of this character. We support this proposal because we believe that it does contain such safeguards.

The bill provides that no visa shall be issued to any person who has advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person or group of persons because of race, religion, or national origin, or to any person who is a Communist or

adherent of any other totalitarian system of government. Thus the bill offers adequate assurance that no person will be admitted into this country who is a Communist or who supports any political system or philosophy contrary to our own democratic form of government.

The bill also contains a number of important safeguards assuring that those admitted to this country will be self-supporting and will not contribute to unemployment of American workers. In the main it adopts safeguards similar to those which have proved beneficial under the Displaced Persons Act. The bill requires that before any person will be admitted to this country assurances shall be executed by a citizen or citizens of the United States that he will be able to obtain suitable employment without displacing some other person from employment, that he and his family will not become public charges, and that they will have adequate housing without displacing others from housing accommodations.

We believe that enactment of this legislation is a necessary part of our fight against Communist tyranny. It will serve the best interests of our own Nation and of the free world by providing an assurance to the many refugees who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and to the millions still enslaved under Communist tyranny that they have not been forgotten and that we in the United States recognize that their devotion to democracy constitutes a fundamental contribution to the cause of freedom everywhere.

On behalf of the American Federation of Labor, I therefore urge the committee to recommend enactment of S. 1917, the Emergency Migration Act of 1953.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The American Friends Service Committee, in testifying on behalf of emergency legislation for the admission to the United States of a share of Europe's uprooted people, would like to refer to its testimony presented at about this same time last year in regard to the so-called Celler bill, or H. R. 7376. A copy of this statement is attached. The intervening year has served to strengthen the convictions therein expressed as to the urgency of the need for action by this country to accept a reasonable number of these victims of war and its aftermath. During this time, the number of refugees and escapees has steadily increased, whereas opportunities for resettlement have been on the decline.

We are glad, therefore, that President Eisenhower has taken the lead in urging emergency legislation and that the Congress is acting on his suggestion. We feel that 240,000 special immigrants in 2 years is a number that this country can readily absorb, as shown by the outstandingly successful experience with similar immigration under the Displaced Persons Act, and that legislation should be promptly enacted to provide for at least this number. Such legislation will mean not only offering a haven to those we accept but also providing a stimulus and encouragement to other countries to take similar steps.

The American Friends Service Committee is motivated entirely by religious and humanitarian considerations in urging this legislation. On this basis, we believe that a special plea should be made for inclusion of European refugees now stranded in the Middle East and in China. All the evidence, including firsthand observations of a member of our own staff who has recently returned from the Orient, indicates not only that the latter group, especially, is in a position of considerable potential danger but also that their only hope for reestablishment in a normal life lies in overseas migration. The total number involved is not large—estimates are in the neighborhood of 20,000—so that positive action by the United States at this point, in cooperation with countries which are already offering asylum to members of this group, would go far to clear up this particularly acute phase of the world refugee problem.

In plans for immigration under a new emergency act we would hope that the pattern established by the creation of State displaced persons commissions would again be followed, since such commissions played an important role in developing public interest in the program and in encouraging resettlement opportunities widely dispersed throughout the country.

We believe that our own experience in providing, through Friends meetings for worship, sponsorship for displaced persons under the Displaced Persons Act is pertinent to our testimony in behalf of new emergency legislation. The Society of Friends, numerically a very small group, sponsored 234 DP and Volksdeutsche families, comprising 703 individuals. While there were, of course, problems

involved in these sponsorships and some disappointments in regard to those sponsored we can safely state that the number of unsatisfactory adjustments was remarkably small whereas in the vast majority of cases reports of meetings regarding their DP or Volksdeutsche families have been full of admiration and enthusiasm. The following excerpts are only illustrative of scores of favorable reports which we have received from sponsors throughout the country:

"On the whole, the report can be entirely favorable. Mrs. A and her two sons are all employed. The joint family income is entirely satisfactory, so they have already bought on their own a new refrigerator, a washing machine, a vacuum cleaner, and other household equipment. The family has been entirely cooperative and eager to find out about life in America and all it may imply. They are now traveling every week in their own car to English classes which they all enjoy."

"May I say that L. V. is still living with the group, is a stockholding member of the cooperative, and has been completely self-supporting since his first week here. He voluntarily repaid all the money which was advanced to him within a very short time, although much of it was intended as a gift."

"Our family have been cooperative in attempting to adjust. They attend citizenship class at Chester twice weekly. They are saving to bring over Mr. K's brother."

"For the most part, they have been cooperative in our efforts to assist them and to adjust to United States life. We have found, however, that the higher the I. Q. or the more education involved the more difficult it is for the DP to become adjusted. * * * In each case we have loaned funds to the families involved and we have found that in each case the families have returned the loans through periodic partial payments, and that within a year and a half all loans have been repaid (six families were sponsored by the above)."

"We have about rockbottom minimum of problems with both our families, and we trust that others who have brought families over have had as rewarding an experience as we have. * * * Financially everything is in good order. C. has been earning enough to pay for complete new dentures, to send frequent parcels to members of her family in Germany, to outfit herself and her child practically from head to foot, and to save something in addition. Furthermore, for as long ahead as anyone can see, there will always be a demand for the kind of reliable cook general that she is. She has Blue Cross and Blue Shield insurance for them both."

"Members of the Friends Church had only words of joy and praise for the J. S. family, which arrived on October 25, 1950. A house has been furnished for them and he is working at the Carmel Screw Works. They are deeply grateful people and are really meaning a tremendous lot to both the Friends group and wider community."

"In answer to your inquiry about our DP family, we can say they are fine. They are loved and respected by the community and are faithful to their work. They have a home and work here as long as they want it."

"A better than average workman in the beginning, Mike has steadily improved as he came to know what was required of him, while Martha has made her way into the hearts of many friends. Little 8-month-old Stephen contributes much to their apparent happiness. Intelligent, conscientious, and adaptable, they have made excellent progress, and, at the end of a year and 5 months, fit into the life of the community very well, and we feel will make worthy and useful citizens of the country they are already planning to adopt."

We feel that there is every reason to believe that refugees admitted under new legislation would establish equally satisfactory records, and that in providing, in the best American tradition, haven for our share of these homeless people we will not only be contributing to the solution of one of the most urgent of postwar problems but also adding able and valuable future citizens to the American population. We regret deeply the fact that no emergency legislation on behalf of refugees and expellees was passed by the last Congress and feel that it would be tragic if the present Congress should fail to act decisively for the alleviation of the crucial human problem involved.

The American Friends Service Committee, the service arm of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), has been active on behalf of refugees and war victims since the time of the First World War and especially since the days of the Nazi persecutions. Out of this experience and our experience in helping in the rehabilitation of war-devastated areas of the world has come a strengthening of our basic conviction that we are indeed our brothers' keepers and that the United States, with its vast natural and productive resources, has an obligation to share both its resources and its opportunities with the less fortunate. This is not only a Christian duty on the part of those of us who share the Christian faith, it is also in the long run a matter of actual self-interest since it contributes to the increased well-being and stability of a world in a state of dangerous chaos.

One of the important ways in which this country can and should share with others is by supporting international efforts and agencies, preferably under United Nations auspices, for the solution of the pressing problems of refugees, displaced persons, and surplus populations, and, at the same time, by opening its own doors to a fair share of these persons. Toward this end, and also toward the general end of securing a sound, fair, and liberal basic immigration law, we have been urging the adoption of liberalized immigration legislation. We feel that the recent action of Congress in rejecting such legislation is regrettable.

Since this action has nevertheless now been taken and the hope of general liberalized legislation is postponed into the indefinite future, we are in favor of temporary legislation to continue special immigration, particularly of displaced persons and refugees. The Congress should recognize, however, that although the measure before them is of a temporary and emergency nature, the problems to which it offers a very partial and inadequate solution are not. The problem of overpopulation is a long-standing, on-going one calling for many approaches and for our best cooperation in study and action on an international scale over a period of years. The problem of refugees, although more emergency in nature, can hardly be called a temporary one, since it goes back to the First World War and appears to be a phenomenon of our times with which we shall have to reckon for years to come. Any temporary legislation should not blind us to this fact or permit us to relax with the feeling that we have made any kind of basic attack on these problems.

Even in a situation which is an emergency one, recent history has demonstrated that we cannot rely on emergency measures if we are honestly concerned to help to rescue the victims of war or oppression. Shortly before the war, efforts to secure emergency legislation to bring in a few thousand refugee children outside the quota met with failure, and throughout the tragic years of refugee flight from Nazi terror thousands of people died in concentration camps who could have been readily rescued but for the rigidity of our quota system. After the war, we saw that more than a year of effort was required to secure emergency legislation in the form of the Displaced Persons Act and when urgent need for revision was demonstrated it took another 2 years to secure the necessary amendments.

We feel, therefore, that events have abundantly proved the inadequacy of a piecemeal emergency approach to the matter of making this country a continuing haven for the oppressed—as it has proudly proclaimed and proved itself in its past history. Therefore while approving, in view of present failure to liberalize basic law, whatever emergency steps can be taken at this time to continue the flow of refugee and surplus-population immigration, we by no means accept it as a substitute for basic changes in our immigration law. Such changes should establish a degree of flexibility in quota regulations that will make possible immediate and generous response to future emergency situations without the necessity for emergency legislation. We shall continue to work for such basic changes and for the other immigration provisions for which we have already indicated our support in previous statements to this committee.

STATEMENT OF ANDREW E. RICE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

My name is Andrew E. Rice. As executive director of the American Veterans Committee (AVC), I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to urge the passage of S. 1917, a bill to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special-quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands.

The members of the American Veterans Committee are veterans who have fought for the basic freedoms of American democracy in World War I, World War II, and in Korea. As patriotic Americans, we believe in the preservation of the ideals and principles which are synonymous to peoples all over the world with the American heritage.

Deploing the harsh restrictive provisions of the McCarran immigration legislation passed by the Congress last year, the American Veterans Committee opposed passage of that law as inimical to the best interests of the United States in resisting the Communist threat. The AVC hailed the recommendations of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization proposing revision of that law as crucial in our ideological struggle with the totalitarian Communist movement. AVC maintains that a liberal, up-to-date immigration policy is necessary to reaffirm America's position as the citadel of freedom and as a haven for the victims of totalitarianism.

The passage of S. 1917 would help alleviate the sufferings of thousands of refugees who have fled the Iron Curtain countries. It would also show the free world that the United States is willing to do its part to relieve the economic crisis which overpopulated nations such as Greece, Italy, and the Netherlands are facing. The expellees and nationals who would be admitted to the United States under this legislation cannot come into the United States under the present quota system which the recently enacted McCarran law has set up.

AVC calls for the support of President Eisenhower's request that 120,000 such people be admitted to the United States over a period of 2 years, to join with other nations in helping alleviate the distress of peoples who have suffered under Communist rule and who have been left homeless refugees.

The United States, by taking the initiative in aiding these peoples who have become victims of Communist oppression and the dislocation of populations in Western Europe, can demonstrate to all men her abiding faith in her own traditions and also strike a blow in the cold war for the humanitarian and political concepts the West stands for.

The American Veterans Committee (AVC) calls upon the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization to report S. 1917 favorably, as a step forward in America's leadership of the free world.

MAY 28, 1953.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization,
Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D. C.*

Regret inability to appear personally at hearings being held on S. 1917. While concern for plight of refugees shown by sponsors of bill is most admirable yet the extremely narrow scope of classes of refugees to benefit from proposed legislation leaves very serious doubts as to its desirability from a psychological viewpoint at a time in world history when our relations with the peoples of Asia and the peoples of the Mediterranean area are so delicate. The deliberate limitation of the classes to European refugees to the exclusion of all others is bound to have unfavorable repercussions on our good relations with the governments and peoples of the excluded areas. Our national association is deeply interested in the tragic plight of the nearly 1 million Palestinian-Arab refugees for which no provision is made in the bill. Unless some provision is made to give some token recognition to this problem and other such equally as grave it is best in our national interest to shelve consideration of such legislation.

GEORGE M. BARAKAT,

*President, National Association of Federations of Syrian and Lebanese
American Clubs.*

ROXBURY, MAINE, May 29, 1953.

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: When you vote on S. 1917 I hope you will follow your honest convictions, and vote against it. You know, deep down in your heart, that these people should not be allowed to come to America under the plan of this bill. When the Senate passed the McCarran-Walter law over the President's veto, it indicated the wishes of the people. We should stand solidly on that vote. This is the time to disregard personal obligations and vote only for the good of America in the years to come. Am sure you will vote "No."

Please include my communication in the hearings.

Very sincerely yours,

MARCIA R. BINFORD
Mrs. Victor A. Binford.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR FELIX F. BURANT,
PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower's appeal in defense of thousands of people who have been made homeless as a consequence of war, Soviet occupation, or other circumstances, and a number of legislative bills submitted to Congress seem to give hope that the fate of these people will be sincerely considered during this session of the Congress.

The Polish Immigration Committee is helping countless Polish refugees, displaced persons, escapees, soldiers of the former Polish Army in exile, and regular quota immigrants in their immigration to the United States and resettlement after their arrival. The committee is also taking care of Polish seamen who left their ships for political reasons and whose immigration status so far has not been adjusted. Any immigration legislation, therefore, is of vital interest to our organization, the Polish quota being very small and under the provision of the Displaced Persons Act mortgaged 50 percent until 1999. Poles applying now for the United States visa have to wait approximately 5 years for their turn.

In his message of April 22, 1953, the President of the United States recommended admission of 240,000 immigrants above quotas to relieve the refugee problem in Western Europe and to ease the problem of overpopulation. We have warmly welcomed this message and would like to state our wholehearted support of the action undertaken by the President and of the devoted work of the committee which strives to implement the President's wish and extend a helping hand to thousands of brave men, who through no fault of their own are forced to live the life of exiles.

After analyzing the legislative bills submitted in connection with emergency immigration, we would like to add a few remarks which express the opinion of the organization and which as resulting from our familiarity with refugee and immigration problems may contribute to a final formulation of the Commission's viewpoint.

Concerning the definitions used in the various proposed bills, we readily subscribe to the definitions used by United States Senator Arthur V. Watkins and Congressman Joseph L. Carrigg that "refugee" or "escapee" means any person of European origin who as a result of World War II or its aftermath ceased to be a resident of one of the presently Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas and whose repatriation to the same European country cannot be effected because of fear of persecution, and who has not been firmly resettled.

Our first concern is for the displaced persons still in Germany. The overwhelming majority of them were covered by the Displaced Persons Act but some did not succeed to complete all the necessary formalities before deadline of January 1, 1952. It is our opinion that those who remain in Germany longest should be given the first consideration irrespective of the number of visas to be allotted to refugees or escapees in Germany and Austria. We must point out that the Polish refugees in Germany are in an extremely difficult situation, being at the mercy of the German authorities which are preoccupied with the problem of their own surplus population and are unfortunately not very friendly disposed to former victims of Nazi oppression.

With regard to refugees in other countries, we firmly believe that the number of 15,000 visas proposed in the majority of the bills for refugees and escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the

North Atlantic Treaty Organization and within Turkey is not adequate and that a greater number should be foreseen in order to cover the existing needs. It should also be pointed out that there seems to be some disproportion between proposed visa allotments to the countries with surplus population and refugees in favor of the overpopulated countries.

At the same time we submit that Sweden should be included in the European countries covered by emergency legislation. Among all Scandinavian countries Sweden has the largest group of political refugees and recent escapees. Because of Sweden's neutrality and geographical proximity to Soviet Russia and some Iron Curtain countries they have reason to be concerned about their safety. The presence of many Soviet agents there increases the feeling of insecurity of these political exiles.

We are convinced that any emergency legislation should include a number of Polish soldiers of the former Polish army in exile, who for some reason or other were unable to take advantage of the Displaced Persons Act and were left in Great Britain. There are about 140,000 Polish soldiers, including dependents, in Great Britain, out of which only 10,300 benefited by the said act. However, quite a number of others, despite their best intentions, were prevented from availing themselves of that opportunity because they either reported too late for registration—the rigidly enforced ultimate date being June 16, 1950—or, though registered, they had not received in time the required assurances, or having all the formalities fulfilled they were not in a position to pay their transportation to the United States, the British Government having withdrawn beginning October 1, 1951, the privilege of free passage granted previously to former Polish soldiers. This somewhat unexpected move of the British Government frustrated plans of many applicants who were not prepared for such a possibility, and since they had no sufficient savings of their own to pay their passage they were deprived of the chance to proceed to the United States. American consuls refused to consider these soldiers under section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act, having assumed that they were firmly resettled, although such an assumption is not justified since they expressed their will to emigrate by registering themselves and by not applying for British citizenship. We think that all those who registered between June 16, 1951, and December 31, 1951, and those whose cases were processed but for some reason not completed should not be classified as firmly resettled but instead should be listed as political refugees. In any case, that group is not a large one; we estimate that the total number will not exceed 4,000 at the utmost, and we think that either an additional number of visas should be allotted to these members of the Polish army in exile left behind in Great Britain or that the total number of visas for refugees should proportionately be increased.

We would like to submit a point deserving special consideration, namely, the reuniting of families. In this respect no difference should be made between relatives of the United States citizens and legal residents in the United States.

Lastly we would suggest that some provisions be made for the relief of the refugees who are actually residing in the United States, but for some reason were unable to adjust their immigration status. We are concerned both with those who arrived here legally and those who arrived illegally seeking political asylum in this country. It is our belief that the same treatment should be allotted to the latter category as that pledged by President Eisenhower to the prisoners of war in Korea who will be offered a chance to live as free men in a free society.

To illustrate, we would like to recall here the case of Polish sailors who 4 years ago deserted Polish ships at New York as an obvious sign of their protest against the present Communist government in Poland. All of them are steadily employed, they have proved to be of good moral character, some of them married and have children. In spite of all these facts they are still under deportation orders and live in constant fear. Private bills introduced by Members of the Congress in their behalf did not help and they are kept in suspense. We will also mention the case of a young heroic Polish seaman, who in July 1951 organized a mutiny—the first of this kind—on the Polish Navy ship *Zuraw* and with 5 other sailors locked all the crew consisting of 6 officers and 32 mates below deck, navigated the ship to Ystad, Sweden, where he surrendered it to Swedish authorities. After a short stay in Sweden, where he did not feel safe, he reached this country as a stowaway, and after a year his status is not yet legalized. You have probably read about a few cases involving Polish refugees, who even after meritorious service in the United States Armed Forces, were ordered deported from this country because they had entered this country illegally as political exiles.

We earnestly hope that the Congress in its present session will enact the vital legislation, thus bringing relief to thousands of oppressed and distressed people

in accordance with the best American tradition. It should not be forgotten that every day of waiting weakens the physical and moral resistance of those unfortunate people and therefore a speedy action in this matter is essential.

We cannot accept the view of one of our most esteemed organizations which objects to President Eisenhower's program to admit 240,000 immigrants from Europe, since "it would mean an addition of 1,250 potential spies and saboteurs to our present powder-keg situation." We may state, on the contrary, that the new immigrants, like our predecessors, are of great value for the development of our economy. More than that, they are in the forefront of struggle against world communism and thousands are already wearing our American uniforms. They know even better than ourselves how to cherish freedom because they had been deprived of it.

As far as the 1,250 potential subversives are concerned, we are certain that our security agencies will know how to weed them out and that 240,000 will not be deprived of sharing with us the blessings of freedom and our American way of life.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THOMAS J. CUIE, NATIONAL COMMANDER,
CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

On behalf of the Catholic War Veterans and its national membership, I wish to endorse the provisions of S. 1917 introduced by Senator Watkins for himself and 17 other distinguished Members of the Senate.

The Catholic War Veterans see in this bill a number of important considerations having to do with our own security and the strengthening of the forces of freedom in Europe.

To begin with, this bill recognizes the special importance of strengthening our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is a well-established fact that Italy, the Netherlands, and Greece are faced with special economic conditions which not only affect their internal stability but relate to their strength as allies in the cause of freedom. These special economic conditions are caused by tyranny, war, and its tragic aftermath. They are not insoluble and in time they will be resolved. At this crucial period in history the problems resulting from those conditions constitute an unduly heavy burden upon some of our key allies.

In Italy, the forces of democracy and freedom led by Premier deGasperi have called upon the free world to assist them in resolving some of these problems. The greatest handicap to economic, social, and political stability in Italy results from unemployment and underemployment. These are the twin danger signs in a young democracy which is striving to provide a healthy and hopeful life for its people. Under the leadership of Premier deGasperi, Italy has made a remarkable recovery, considering the problems which he and his government had to face. But he has found it necessary to caution the leaders of the free world that unless some definite plans are worked out by the nations of the free world to provide economic opportunities for a reasonable number of able and willing Italian workers, social and political unrest will result. The Communist Party of Italy, playing its part as the agent of the alien and predatory schemes of Moscow, continually agitates the conditions which make for social, economic, and political unrest. They claim to be solicitous of the welfare of the Italian people whereas, in reality, they are working day and night for the destruction of the Italian nation. It is clearly in our national interest to do everything we can to assist Premier deGasperi in his efforts to bring a fuller way of life to his people. The passage of S. 1917 would be a most practical demonstration of concern for the welfare of the Italian nation.

In Greece and the Netherlands there are problems much like those in Italy. They must find settlements in the free world for a reasonable number of their people in order to maintain a healthy economic, social, and political system. As members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization we are acting in our own enlightened self-interest to help them become and remain as strong as possible. Here again S. 1917 recognizes these benefits and provides for the admission of a reasonable number of people from these 2 countries.

Germany stands today in the front line in the struggle between the forces of freedom and those of atheistic communism. A strategic part of the frontier between the free world and the slave world of communism is formed by the eastern frontier of the German Federal Republic. Across this frontier have passed thousands of escapees from Communist terror. They have been afforded

asylum in free Germany, despite the overcrowding which already exists as a consequence of the expulsion of millions of persons of German ethnic origin from the areas now occupied by the Communists. Germany can be rightfully proud of her wonderful record of affording asylum to those who have risked their lives to join the ranks of freemen in the West. Chancellor Adenauer is deserving of the praise of all freedom-loving people for the wise leadership he has given to the German nation.

We can give real encouragement to the firm stand taken by the German people to remain free by offering a haven to a reasonable number of the escapees and German expellees who have found first asylum in the German Federal Republic. The same is true of Austria where the number involved is not as great but where the problem has equal importance. S. 1917 provides a practical means of helping both these countries to keep the doors to religious and political asylum in the West open.

In this bill we find all the necessary safeguards on security as are embodied in the Internal Security Act and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The administration of the displaced persons program has demonstrated that there is no basis for the fear that subversives will enter the country under the operation of the program proposed in the Watkins bill. With the proper use of the screening procedure set forth in the Watkins bill, I am confident that these unfortunate refugees from Communist tyranny can be absorbed into the economy of the Nation and will become good citizens—and, please God, their offspring will produce many an outstanding American citizen.

It is well, we believe, to take note of the safeguards set up to prevent the displacement of United States citizens in the area of employment and housing. As an organization of veterans we believe these safeguards are mandatory. We are glad this legislation contains such safeguards for Americans. We are equally well pleased because the legislation contains parallel safeguards for the immigrant. It would be utter folly to pretend that we were throwing open the gates to all immigrants, no matter how badly we felt over their plight, unless we called for assurances that they would have a home here, and a bread-winning job here, that would not displace some United States citizen. Thus we protect our own folks and those we welcome to our shores. By calling for these assurances we make certain these unfortunate refugees will be really welcome.

There is another important consideration on the merits of S. 1917 and this is, there are no discriminations in it. It seeks to deal with the basic human problems of our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and it does just that. In unmistakable language it recognizes the problems as they actually exist and proposes that we, as a Nation, take the lead in bringing about their solution. This is a fine example for the other nations of the free world and it should go a long way toward getting them to take similar action.

We are conscious of the danger in which many refugees from communism find themselves in the Far East. We wish it were possible to provide some measure of relief for them. However, we feel constrained to recognize that at this time we shall be doing our level best if we provide for those refugees and escapees who come within the purview of the Watkins bill. We therefore strongly urge the committee to recommend the passage of the Watkins bill. At the same time, we do hope the committee will give thought to some remedial legislation which will extend the same humanitarian consideration to the unfortunate refugees now living in Asia.

In conclusion, the Catholic War Veterans consider this bill as one of the major steps to be taken in order to implement President Eisenhower's plan for peace and freedom which he proclaimed in his address of April 16, 1953. Through its early passage we can demonstrate to the people of the world that we are prepared to give the leadership demanded by the Communist challenge to the very existence of civilization.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington 6, D. C., June 3, 1955.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congress of Industrial Organizations takes this means of placing before you and the other members of the subcommittee its views with regard to S. 1917. We respectfully request that the subcommittee incorporate this letter in its hearings.

S. 1917 would authorize the admission, as special quota immigrants, of 240,000 immigrants from Europe during the next 2 years. Essentially, this bill would amount to a renewal of the displaced-persons program, which expired about a year ago.

The CIO strongly supported the Displaced Persons Act. We believe that it was a wise and humane measure. Under that act, approximately 400,000 persons were admitted to this country. They have been absorbed into the life of our country with relative ease. The Nation has been enriched by the addition of thousands of farm and factory workers, engineers, doctors, technicians, and other persons possessing other needed and valuable skills. The displaced persons admitted under this program have shown remarkable ability to adapt themselves to American ideologies and institutions. They have fully assumed their obligations as American workers and are rapidly assuming the obligations and securing the rights of American citizenship.

By the admission of these displaced persons, the United States not only strengthened itself, but won friends abroad. The displaced-persons program was clear evidence that the United States, as a leader of the free world, was willing to do herself what she asked other free nations to do—admit refugees to her shores.

These same considerations and others lead us to support S. 1917. Its enactment could be fully justified on humanitarian principles alone. Our experience under the Displaced Persons Act shows that the refugees admitted would make a valuable contribution to American life and that they could, in the numbers proposed, be easily absorbed without any deleterious effect on the economy. Further, it will stimulate resistance to Russian aggression and oppression for us to do our part in offering a new future to those who have escaped from Communist tyranny. This S. 1917 would do by providing special quotas for escapees and expellees from Communist-dominated countries now living in Germany and Austria and elsewhere in Western Europe.

In addition, this legislation would help to ease the burden of overpopulation in parts of Western Europe and in Greece through increased immigration. While the numbers of persons who would be admitted under the bill would be too limited to constitute alone a major contribution toward this end, the adoption of this legislation by this country would no doubt encourage other nations to adopt similar emergency programs, which together might considerably alleviate excess population problems.

We tend to question the desirability of the provision of S. 1917 giving priority to farm workers. This provision might be viewed as a subtle discrimination against certain ethnic groups who have been in the past denied the opportunity to engage in farmwork. Further, we believe that the proper way and the only way to secure and maintain an adequate farm labor force is by improving wage and working conditions on the farms.

Finally, we wish to make it clear that we do not regard this bill as a substitute for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act. We have heretofore stated our opposition to that act, and we shall continue to urge its replacement by fair and liberal permanent legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER, *President.*

THE RUBICON,

New York 4, N. Y., June 9, 1953.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

United States Senate, Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I send you herewith some articles in connection with immigration matters which I ask that the special committee, of which you are chairman, kindly consider in connection with the bill to admit some 240,000 more immigrants into this country.

I believe it is a mistake to have any special legislation that will accomplish that object. There are too many subversives who want to come here and no Government bureau could screen them properly so that they could be excluded. We have had enough lessons in the subversives that have infiltrated every Government bureau, including the White House, during the past 15 years.

Insofar as Italy is concerned, they ought to get some good businessmen in their Government and they would easily find work for many intending immigrants, so that they could make objects for export. I do not believe in importing labor, under present conditions, with the ultimate result that the wealth of this Nation will be siphoned out to foreign lands. That was all right in the past, but we have spent too much money on wars and handouts to warrant any continuance of that policy.

I feel that if your committee has the interest of the Government at heart, it will allow the McCarran-Walter Act to function for a few years.

Kindly include this view in your published report of the committee's activities.

Yours truly,

LUIGI CRISCUOLO, *Editor.*

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington 2, D. C., June 8, 1953.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
The Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: May I please amplify our testimony by giving you our suggestion on the inclusion of the Dutch in S. 1917. Our failure to include reference to this was a serious omission and I hasten to correct it.

It is our belief that legislation to admit citizens of the Netherlands is justified on its own merits for reasons which should not be confused or obscured by inclusion in an emergency bill designed to bring relief to countries and groups incapable of solving their own problems. This is not the situation in the Netherlands, and which itself has contributed and is contributing so generously to the solution of refugees and other postwar problems in Europe and elsewhere. We feel that it would be a doubtful compliment to the great Dutch people and their illustrious Queen to use their high reputation in this country as a factor of support for what we regard as the unwise inclusion in this bill of overpopulation problems in other countries.

Therefore, we would greatly prefer to see our Congress act favorably on one of the bills already introduced for the special nonquota admission of Dutch nationals.

If, after further consideration, your committee should feel that provision for the Dutch should come within the total of 240,000 special visas, we would respectfully suggest the desirability of restricting such visas to "Dutch returnees and flood victims" so that the Congress would avoid setting a precedent of appearing to deal with overpopulation problems via United States immigration, a precedent which many believe is unsound and inadequate.

Again, let me thank you and your committee for their generous reception of our testimony. May I impose on your generosity further to ask that this letter be added to our testimony.

Cordially yours,

A. R. ELLIOTT,
Director, Immigration Services, Department of Church World Service.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 16, 1953.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*Chairman, Senate Immigration Subcommittee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

May we respectfully commend your committee for so promptly initiating consideration of special emergency immigration legislation. As agencies with a worldwide responsibility among refugees and other victims of postwar factors, we unite in this message to you urgently requesting your committee to report out a bill at the earliest practicable moment so that there may be thorough consideration and favorable action before this session of the Congress recesses or adjourns. If action were to be delayed until a later session of Congress such delay in our judgment would involve costs both in terms of our foreign policy and in terms of clamant human factors far too great to contemplate. Therefore, we wish unitedly to support and commend your efforts to secure promptest action.

Dr. PAUL C. EMPIE,
National Lutheran Council.
MSGT. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
Dr. WALTER W. VAN KIRK,
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.
ARTHUR GREENLEIGH,
United Service for New Americans.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., May 27, 1953.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

Chairman, Senate Subcommittee, Immigration and Naturalization:

Pray following message be incorporated in testimony re Senate bill 1917: Dear Chairman, the President of the United States and the authors of Senate bill 1917 are to be congratulated for the keen interest and foresight in endeavoring to relieve a serious problem of Europe caused by the war and postwar period and the threatening destructive monster of communism. America is vitally affected. The Independent Order Sons of Italy, which I am proud to represent, is in full accord with the adoption of bill S. 1917 in its present form with one sole exception. It is suggested and recommended that only children adopted during their minority be benefited by the new bill. This would avoid abuse of them all and wholesale indiscriminate adoption at any age to circumvent our basic immigration laws and restrictions with that sole exception. It is prayed that bill S. 1917 be approved and made the emergency act of our country.

Respectfully submitted.

PETER C. GIAMBALVO,

National Chairman, Public Relations Committee, Independent Order Sons of Italy, Inc.

STAMFORD, CONN., May 28, 1953.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH,

Senate Office Building:

Please vote against bill S. 1917. Our U. S. boys sent to Korea, etc. Countries not doing their share. Housing and conditions hard. Limit to taxpayers pay and spend. Please include my communication in written hearings.

V. P. GRIFFIN.

STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, THE HEBREW SHELTERING AND IMMIGRANT AID SOCIETY, AND UNITED SERVICE FOR NEW AMERICANS (WHICH OPERATES OVERSEAS THROUGH THE AMERICAN JEWISH JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE)

The National Council of Jewish Women, the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, and United Service for New Americans (which operates overseas through the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee), present the following statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee in connection with its hearings on S. 1917. These agencies have aided hundreds of thousands of newcomers to the United States; have a continuous history in the field of immigration and settlement of nearly 70 years; have developed a concept of planned settlement and Americanization aid which combines the techniques of social welfare and technical aid for the immigrant. They operate through a network of local affiliates and provide a program of aid throughout the country that includes financial and medical aid, individual and family rehabilitation, employment services and loan funds, retraining, special services for children, protection and social and cultural adjustment. Overseas, refugees and immigrants are similarly aided where necessary and guided through the maze of migration technicalities and problems.

The number of our coreligionists overseas who can benefit from emergency legislation is comparatively small. The agencies making this presentation have a humanitarian concern for the welfare of all displaced and unsettled persons who we hope will benefit by this bill, and for the many persons in Greece, Italy, and Holland who because of the aftermath of World War II must emigrate. As operating agencies, we feel that immigration legislation which meets these needs will benefit not only the persons aided but, also, the United States in its domestic affairs and its foreign policy. We recognize that even the admission of 240,000 persons in 2 years will not fully solve the problem of the refugee, the displaced and the unsettled. However, this action has great significance for the world as a demonstration of the interest and responsibility of the United States and as a stimulus to other receiving countries which look to the United States for leadership in the solution of such problems. We believe that it will hearten the displaced and unsettled persons including those who have risked their lives fleeing from Communist terror to seek refuge in the western democracies.

As agencies working in migration and resettlement, we have given considerable thought to the basic immigration policy of the United States. We feel strongly that it is essential in order to meet emergency problems such as this and others which might arise in the future, that the United States immigration law be revised to eliminate the national origins quota system and to increase the number of persons to be admitted annually. The Immigration and Nationality Act passed last year is inflexible and, therefore, incapable of meeting emergency problems such as face us now.

We welcome the interest shown by the President of the United States in proposing emergency legislation and recommending a study leading to revision of the basic immigration law. Since the revision of the immigration law is still under study and because there are these emergency needs and because of our concern for the people involved and also because of the requirements of our foreign policy, we think it is important to have emergency legislation to permit at least 240,000 people to enter the United States.

We also commend Senator Watkins and his cosponsors for having introduced this legislation which in great part takes cognizance of the needs which exist at this time and because this legislation is based on humanitarian considerations.

In reviewing the provisions of S. 1917, we would like to call attention to the fact that there are several urgent problems and principles, which we believe merit attention.

1. European refugees stranded in China and Manchuria who face extermination unless some provision is made for their admission. We think at least 5,000 visas should be available for them.

2. Refugees and displaced persons temporarily in the United States who are unable to return to their countries of origin and who have no form of relief under the present law. We urge that at least 2,000 visas be made available to this group for the purpose of adjusting their status.

3. Although provision is made for 15,000 escapees in NATO countries, we believe that this number is inadequate to meet the needs of the escapee problem in these countries even as a taken. We urge that 50,000 visas be made available to this group. It is our opinion that the term "firm resettlement" is vague, indefinite, and difficult to administer. We would suggest that the term be changed to read "persons who have not been permanently resettled with members of their immediate family" or "persons who are not nationals of the country in which they reside."

4. S. 1917 makes provision for persons in Greece, Italy, and Holland. However, in describing the persons to be covered, the term, "ethnic," is used. This word has no scientific meaning, is not truly descriptive and has implications which are not consistent with American ideals. We recommend that the language read "nations or repatriates from the colonies and residents" which is the apparent intent of the section.

5. We would like to comment further on the priorities set up in S. 1917. We are in agreement with the priority given for the reunion of family members. This is consistent with the humanitarian purposes of this bill and with the tradition of the United States.

6. It is our feeling, however, that the proposed priority for persons with occupational skills is not consistent with United States tradition since it tends to lose sight of the fact that the need of all in this situation is equally great. It dilutes the humanitarian basis of this bill.

We are concerned also by the inclusion of a provision which ties the immigrant to a specific job. It has implications of peonage which are abhorrent to American thinking and ideals. We believe that the real test should be whether the prospective immigrants are sound people, physically, mentally, morally, and politically.

We hope that consideration will be given to these suggestions in order that a measure which has great possibilities for alleviation of human misery may be so framed as to achieve the greatest possible good in this humanitarian effort.

PORTLAND 5, MAINE, May 31, 1953.

Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: As one of your constituents I am writing you in reference to McCarran-Walter immigration law 414.

It has come to my attention that Senate bill 1917 has been presented in the Senate and that you have placed your name on this bill endorsing it.

I am not in favor of Senate bill 1917 as it would undermine the McCarran-Walter immigration law.

I feel that the present immigration law should not be changed to allow 240,000 persons entry to the United States. I feel that we do not have adequate means of screening these persons who wish to come to the United States.

Many of these would-be immigrants are so-called expellees trace their origin to Russia or her satellite countries.

Where is employment to be found for these people?

These expellees would in a very few years be eligible for social security, aid for the aged and unemployment compensation. As a citizen and a taxpayer I feel that we should not be burdened with this additional expense.

Why is it that some of these men are not serving in the NATO forces rather than drafting our American boys?

Please include my communication in the hearings,

Sincerely yours,

BARBARA W. HEYWOOD,
MRS. ROY E. HEYWOOD.

STATEMENT OF FORTUNE POPE, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER, IL PROGRESSO, ITALO-AMERICANO, NEW YORK, N. Y.

INTRODUCTION

We support wholeheartedly S. 1917 because it offers for the first time to the people of Italy a recognition of their problem and an extension of at least a helping hand in partially ameliorating a condition whose gravity becomes daily more pressing.

When enacted, this bill will be a boon to the morale of the people and refugees in Italy. It will do even more in the field of sound international relations when Italians will know that America has given an initial impetus to the solution of its refugees and overpopulation problem. It will be a contribution to peace in which other immigrating nations of the world can join.

THE GENERAL SITUATION IN ITALY

It will in part, replenish our short labor supply in the metal, needle, and durable goods industries and make more friends for America everywhere.

The Italian population at present numbers over 46,500,000 persons, in country of which two-thirds is virtually unproductive and in which mineral resources and raw materials are almost completely lacking. Owing to the very low ratio of natural resources to population, the per capita income in 1950 was only \$276 and food consumption amounted to only 2,443 calories per day.

As a result of the relative freedom of trade and the movement of capital and men in the pre-1914 era, Italy was able, from the time of its unification (1870) at one and the same time to increase its industrial and agricultural production, to expand its external trade and to organize migratory movements, which followed those of the countries of Northern and Western Europe and reached their peak in 1913, with 853,000 emigrants. As a result, however, of the First World War and the restrictive legislation adopted by some of the principal immigration countries and further intensified during the great crisis of 1929-33, emigration was substantially reduced and no longer made its contribution to the solution of the problem of surplus population in Italy.

The Second World War completely brought to an end the flow of emigrants. It was resumed again after the war but without attaining the same proportions as in the past (1949: 170,000 migrants—1950, approximately 150,000 migrants).

Although Italy allocated 20 percent of its gross national income to capital investment—a very high proportion in view of the very moderate per capita income—and although very considerable efforts have been and are being made by the Government in the field of economic development (import of machine tools with the help of Marshall aid, agrarian reform, the Fanfani plan for housing, the Cassa Mezzogiorno providing for an annual expenditure, spread over 10 years, of 100 billion lire for the complete exploitation of the underdeveloped regions of the south and the islands), the unemployment figure stands at 1,792,000, while the figure for latent unemployed is estimated at 2 million sufficient proof that the overpopulation problem in Italy remains as serious and tragic as ever.

About 480,000 refugees from the former colonies in Africa and the Aegean Islands, from Venetia Giulia and from Dalmatia have come to aggravate further this extremely unhealthy situation. To point out the political and social dangers which are inherent in these conditions would be superfluous, but it may be noted that they impede the efforts to solve the country's economic and production problems, make it more difficult to reduce prices, and lead to an unfavorable balance of payments, which is Italy's bottleneck and the vicious circle which threatens to stifle its economy.

In relation to the national area the number of inhabitants is 154 persons per square kilometer and this figure is further augmented if the proportion is restricted to the workable land area alone in which case the ratio is 285 inhabitants per square kilometer.

This disproportion is still more notable when compared with the situation in other countries, for example, France, 75 inhabitants for square kilometer; Spain, 56 inhabitants for square kilometer; Czechoslovakia, 97; United States, 19; Canada, 1.4; Argentina, 6; Brazil, 5.9; and China, 47.6.

The demographic situation has become progressively worse in recent years with the increase of births over deaths, and the increase caused by the war added to the regular yearly growth of 442,000.

The war brought large numbers of refugees from the metropolitan and colonial territories severed from the national sovereignty and ended the flow of emigration.

Italy lost approximately 900,000 hectares of metropolitan territory in Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia and approximately 350 million hectares in colonies. And the population in these areas did not remain, but instead returned almost in its entirety to Italy, creating the serious refugee problem already aggravated by the large number of citizens homeless from the war and obliged to flee to other towns.

The following approximate figures are by way of illustration:

(a) Refugees from Africa.....	225, 000
(b) Refugees from the Dodecanese Islands.....	5, 000
(c) Refugees from Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia.....	155, 000
(d) Refugees from abroad.....	125, 000

The above-listed refugees are in addition to those compelled to leave their own town because destroyed. Of the more than 3,500,000 homeless, more than 2 million moved to other towns. This brings the total number of displaced persons in Italy to more than 2 million, of whom 500,000 are refugees.

The problem of the increase in population in Italy has assumed, consequently, a considerable gravity, all the more when it is considered that during the war the normal flow of emigration representing an average of 150,000 persons per year stopped entirely.

Italy has been consequently obliged to confront immense difficulties to give work and living conditions to all these citizens, while compelled to provide simultaneously for the war widows, orphans, disabled, tubercular, and others injured in the war.

As a result, the Italian economy from before the war until today has been obliged to exert tremendous efforts to maintain these additional millions of persons despite the destruction of the war, the loss of territories, etc.

The efforts made can be summarized in the following figures:

Employment in the various sectors of production

Sectors	1938			1949		
	Laborers	Office workers	Total in thousands	Laborers	Office workers	Total in thousands
Agriculture.....	2, 319	17	2, 336	2, 335	20	2, 355
Industry and transport.....	3, 672	257	3, 929	3, 678	333	4, 011
Commerce.....	183	222	405	201	249	450
Credit, etc.....	6	98	104	8	138	146
Public administration.....	582	447	1, 029	788	732	1, 520
Various.....	784	144	928	785	147	932
Total.....	7, 546	1, 185	8, 731	7, 795	1, 619	9, 414

These figures show that from 1938 to 1949 more than 700,000 additional workers were employed. In 1951 the figures are certainly higher.

The index of farm production which fell from 100 in 1938 to 61 in 1945, climbed in 1949 to 90 and in 1950 to 95. For many products, the index of 1938 has been notably exceeded.

Today the index of industrial production has not only reached the total of 1938, but has notably exceeded it, arriving at 128 in December 1950.

In addition the index of production in the individual industrial sectors indicate that in every field the prewar index has been reached and surpassed despite many difficulties and the high cost of production, especially of labor.

It is true that more millions of workers have been absorbed than before the war, but this increase has forced upon business and government an antieconomic burden of labor and imposed as a result reduced wages and income.

If the relationship between the farm population and the workable land in the more important communities is considered, it is easy to see that Italy has a coefficient (68) superior to all other countries, which is to say that Italy has a farm population of 68 persons per 100 hectares of arable land, while Germany has 50, England 23, Australia 5.

For example, the number of workers per square kilometer of productive land area is in:

Italy.....	25.50
Germany.....	12.70
France.....	8.56
England.....	5.00
United States.....	1.87

The number of calories per inhabitant in Italy is very low:

Countries:	Calories	Countries:	Calories
Argentina.....	3,190	Czechoslovakia.....	2,689
Australia.....	3,165	Austria.....	2,636
United States.....	3,128	Poland.....	2,622
Switzerland.....	3,096	Western Germany.....	2,528
Sweden.....	3,070	Greece.....	2,468
Finland.....	3,070	East Germany.....	2,410
Denmark.....	3,064	Italy.....	2,343
Canada.....	3,062	Pakistan.....	2,028
England.....	3,030	Japan.....	1,834
France.....	2,740	India.....	1,621

The situation is further aggravated by the fact that the population in the south of Italy consumes much less than that in the north. For example:

	Percent of the population	Percent of total consumption in Italy
Northern Italy.....	43.92	60.19
Central Italy.....	18.44	20.67
Southern Italy.....	25.28	12.85
Insular Italy.....	12.56	6.29
Total.....	100.00	100.00

These facts demonstrate that northern Italy with 40 per cent of the population consumes 60 percent of the foodstuffs, which is to say that the calories index in the southern and insular regions is much lower than the national average.

The following examples further illustrate the above data:

Consumption of sugar in Italy is below 16 kilograms per person per year (Colombia, over 48 kilograms).

Consumption of potatoes in Italy is under 65 kilograms per person per year (Germany and Poland over 1,845 kilograms).

Consumption of fats in Italy is under 12 kilograms per person per year (Norway, Belgium, Canada exceed 18 kilograms).

Consumption of meat in Italy is under 17 kilograms per person (Australia over 102 kilograms).

Consumption of milk in Italy is under 80 kilograms per person per year (Finland, Norway over 240 kilograms).

Reviewing the above facts it is obvious that the Italian demographic problem cannot be resolved with only the means at the disposal of the Italian economy.

Few countries in the world have succeeded without raw materials, without extensive territory, or without colonies to maintain such a large number of inhabitants as there are in Italy.

To meet these obligations every effort has been made, recourse has been had to every legislative expedient, and every possible economic initiative has been taken with the support of ECA and MSA.

All the ingenuity of the Italian people has gone into this effort, with first credit going to their spirit of sacrifice and the modest standard of living they sustain. Surplus labor has been imposed on business and wages have been restricted to maintain more workers and similar measures have been resorted to, but this process has gone to the very limit and cannot be further exploited by the country. The condition of the Italian population must not be judged by the kind of life lived in some circles of the large cities. The group of citizenry is but a small minority. The great mass of the Italian people live in very modest circumstances, especially in the central, southern, and insular regions.

It is absolutely necessary for Italy that her citizens have the liberty to emigrate because only by this expedient can such a great number of people be settled. These people, by reason of their present miserable living conditions, constitute a great danger and the desirable economic and social equilibrium which is fundamental to prosperity and peace can be got only by emigration.

The settlement of a considerable number of these dislocated persons would considerably relieve the situation in Italy because granted that it is already impossible to absorb the normal population increase by internal production and free emigration to various countries, it is absolutely precluded that the internal Italian market can provide labor for all the persons displaced by the war.

THE ITALIAN DEMOGRAPHIC SITUATION

The already high population density is continually on the increase; from 91 inhabitants per square kilometer since 1871 it rose to 130.2 in 1928; from 141.8 in 1938 it has reached 154.4 inhabitants per square kilometer today. (The world average is 18.) The last figure applied to the entire national territory results to 167.5 inhabitants per square kilometer of arable land (world average 34.6) and 285 per square kilometer for usable land (world average 195.4).

Furthermore, while the density ratio rose in all three fields and the possibility is scant for increasing the percentage for arable land, agriculture and forestal area in general, other countries have considerable opportunity for lowering their density proportion.

At any rate, confining ourselves to the density in the total national area it is obvious that Italy has a density among the highest in the world, with 154.4 inhabitants per square kilometer. The European average is 78 (excluding Russia with a density of 8 inhabitants per square kilometer); average for Asia, 47; America, 8; Africa, 7; Oceania, 1. Among the great European nations France has 75.4 inhabitants per square kilometer Spain has 57.2, Portugal 94, Switzerland 112.4, Czechoslovakia 97.5, Yugoslavia 63.3, Poland 78.4, Rumania 67.4, Hungary 99.2, Sweden 15.6, Norway 10, Iceland 1.4. On other continents, the United States has 19.3 inhabitants per square kilometer, Canada has 1.4, Argentina 6, Brazil 5.9, Chile 7.8, Colombia 9.7, Peru 6.7, Venezuela 5.1, Egypt 20, Ethiopia 18.4, South Africa 9.9, Tunisia 20.9, India 109.9, China 47.6.

Naturally, the demographic density is not the same in all the regions of Italy. The most densely populated region is Campania (331 inhabitants per square kilometer) followed by Liguria (282) and by Lombardy (263). The less populated regions are Sardinia (51 inhabitants per square kilometer), Lucania (62), Umbria (94).

More than half the Italian population lives in towns with more than 10,000 inhabitants. Thus, 81 cities have a population of from 30,000 to 50,000 inhabitants; 25 cities have a population of 50,000 to 100,000; 25 cities have more than 100,000 inhabitants, and of these 3 exceed 1 million population. The total number of municipalities is 7,764.

In Italy there are 11 million families of which 7,500,000 have children living at home. On the average these latter families have 2.7 children per family with a minimum of 2.2 in the families of office workers and 3.3 in the families of agricultural communities.

In the distribution of the sexes the women markedly exceed men in the Italian population. This excess which was 797,000 on April 21, 1936, has risen to 1,167,000 by December 31, 1949.

The age distribution of the Italian population can be tabulated as follows:

Age groups	Apr. 21, 1936		Dec. 31, 1949	
	Thousands of inhabitants	Percent	Thousands of inhabitants	Percent
0 to 9.....	8,567	20.4	8,127	17.5
10 to 20.....	4,326	10.3	4,170	9.0
15 to 20.....	3,750	8.9	4,899	10.6
21 to 34.....	9,745	23.2	9,786	21.1
35 to 44.....	5,114	12.1	6,756	14.6
45 to 54.....	4,186	10.0	5,116	11.0
55 to 64.....	3,202	7.6	3,863	8.3
65 and over.....	3,131	7.5	3,704	8.0
Total.....	42,021	100.0	46,421	100.0

In the period under study then there has been an increase of the active population (15 to 65 years of age) which rose from 26,997 to 30,420 and from 61.8 percent of the total to 65.5 percent.

Approximately 48 percent of the working population are males.

About 48 percent of the working population (persons from 10 years old and up who exercise a profession or other known activity) is devoted to agriculture (of which 28 percent are day laborers or otherwise hired), 29 percent is in industry (of which 77 percent are employees), 8 percent are in commerce (of which about 36 percent are employees), and the remainder are in the free professions, on the public payroll, and in other activities.

Altogether about 52 percent are employed (manual workers, 38 percent; office workers, 8 percent; service personnel, 6 percent) and the remainder is composed of independent producers (farmers, farm renters, merchants, artisans, professional men).

THE MOVEMENT OF THE ITALIAN POPULATION

We have already seen how the period of 1936 to 1950 the Italian population grew by approximately $4\frac{1}{2}$ million, of whom 2,800,000 are in the working population. We will now examine the causes of this increase.

Approximately the marriage rate varies from 7 to 8 per thousand except in exceptional periods (war years and post years).

The birthrate dropped gradually from about 37 percent in the period of 1872-75 to 19.2 percent in 1950. In general, in these recent years it has stabilized at 20 percent.

The mortality rate has dropped rapidly and more quickly than the birth rate. From 30.5 percent in the period 1872-75 it has dropped to 9.7 percent in 1950, which was one of the lowest percentages in Europe.

This rapid decline in mortality is verified in almost all the causes of death except tumors, for which the average per year rose from 0.427 percent in the period 1887-92 to 1.022 percent in 1949, and diseases of the circulatory system, for which the figures are respectively 1.57-2.08 percent. That for tuberculosis from an average in 1887-92 of 2.061 to 0.492 percent in 1949; for malaria, 0.567 and 0.002 percent; for infectious and parasitic diseases in general, from 6.466 to 0.939 percent; from pneumonia and bronchitis, 2.351 and 0.969 percent.

The net increase in the Italian population (number of births minus deaths) is about 10 percent per year, and was precisely 442,000 in 1950. An increase of this size corresponds to a labor levy of at least 200,000 persons annually that burden the national economy, whose deficiency of capital makes very difficult an expansion corresponding to the arrival of new workers and new consumers, but which despite this, makes the greatest possible effort to solve this problem, which is one of the serious social and economic problems in the country. From 1939 until today the problem of the increasing population has become progressively worse for many reasons, chief of which are the following:

(a) Shrinkage of total national territory caused by the losses imposed by the peace treaty.

(b) The loss of the colonial territories and empire.

(c) The influx to Italy of refugees.

(d) The creation of a large class of persons obliged by the war to abandon their homes and their country of origin to move into another zone of the country.

(e) The stoppage and subsequent insufficient rate of emigration.

The persons in the classes referred to in (c) and (d) can be classified as dislocated persons.

Dr. Donald R. Taft in Human Migration says, "Under conditions of overpopulation men do not migrate; they lie down and die." The people of Italy are not characterized by an absence of hope and energy, they are among the most active migrants in recent history.

According to statistics released by the Istituto Centrale di Statistica Italiana, emigration by sea during the year 1951 amounted to 143,480 persons of which 88,915 were males and 54,465 were females. In 1950 the number of emigrants were 145,169 of which 94,866 were males and 50,503 were females.

The total number from the various regions for 1951 were as follows:

<i>Region</i>			
	<i>Number</i>		<i>Number</i>
Piemonte.....	3,521	Marche.....	3,039
Val d'Aosta.....	53	Lazio.....	7,322
Lombardia.....	4,728	Abruzzi e Molise.....	17,418
Trentino, Alto Adige.....	854	Campania.....	16,621
Veneto.....	9,471	Puglia.....	6,271
Friuli-Venezia Giulia.....	6,268	Basilicata.....	4,110
Liguria.....	3,334	Calabria.....	23,571
Emilia-Romagna.....	4,354	Sicilia.....	17,858
Toscana.....	4,943	Sardegna.....	675
Umbria.....	701	Unspecified.....	8,307

<i>Destination</i>			
	<i>Number</i>		<i>Number</i>
France.....	2,633	Bolivia.....	64
Yugoslavia.....	1	Columbia.....	228
Great Britain.....	26	Chile.....	2,094
Spain.....	338	Other South American coun-tries.....	70
Mediterranean countries.....	8,755	Eritreat.....	650
Continental countries.....	394	Somalia.....	641
Canada.....	21,277	Kenya.....	81
United States of America.....	9,668	Asia.....	190
Central America.....	331	Australia.....	17,454
Argentina.....	55,261		
Brazil.....	8,936		

¹ It should be explained that 3,991 of this figure represents nonquota immigration to the United States of America and that this number is over and above the 5,677 total quota allowed to Italy under the 1924 Immigration Act as amended.

LOSSES ON NATIONAL TERRITORY

April 21, 1936, the territorial extent of Italy was 31,019,000 hectares of which 28,549,700 hectares were agricultural and forestal area. June 30, 1950, the 2 figures were respectively reduced to 30,103,088 hectares and 27,758,306 hectares with a decrease of approximately 916,000 hectares for the national territory and approximately 791,400 hectares for the agricultural and forestal area. The population of these zones taken from the motherland (mostly in Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia) subsequently took refuge in Italy as will be seen below.

THE LOSS OF COLONIES AND POSSESSIONS

Before the war Italy had the following possessions and colonies:
Italian provinces of Libya (considered a part of the national territory)

	<i>Area in hectares</i>
Libyan Desert.....	55,394,000
Italian islands in Aegean Sea.....	120,560,000
Italian East Africa (Eritrea, Ethiopia, Italian Somaliland).....	268,200
	172,533,000
Total.....	348,755,000.

Approximately 500,000 hectares were in full process of cultivation in Libya, Eritrea, and Somaliland alone, and extraordinary possibilities for colonization existed in these lands of which Italy retains now only the trusteeship of Somaliland with some 10,000 hectares under cultivation and with the greater part of the installations destroyed.

More will be said below of the departure of the Italians who had made these countries fertile with their sacrifice and their toil.

At this point it is sufficient to consider the obstacle that the loss of these territories place in the way of the Italian population expansion and the characteristics of Italian colonization which was never a colonization of exploitation, but always colonization which had work for its scope.

THE CATEGORIES OF DISLOCATED PERSONS IN ITALY

Under the name of "dislocated persons" at least the following categories should be included in Italy:

- (a) Refugees from Africa (Libya, Cirenaica, Eritrea, Somaliland, Ethiopia).
- (b) Refugees from Dodecanese Islands.
- (c) Refugees from Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia.
- (d) Refugees from abroad.

Persons who, because of the war, remained homeless and were obliged to abandon their dwelling and native towns to take refuge in other parts of Italy are also to be included in this category.

THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Refugees from Africa (Italian colonies)

It is difficult to give an exact figure on the statistics of this group insofar as their exodus took place during and after the war without the possibility of a precise computation. At any rate, the official figures do not differ widely from the actual number of this group of refugees.

According to the U. N., estimate for 1939 to 1948, the number of Italians who are residents in Italian Africa was the following:

	1939	1948	Difference
Libya.....	118,718	45,000	73,718
Eritrea.....	72,500	28,000	47,500
Somaliland.....	19,000	5,000	14,000
Ethiopia.....	88,500	88,500
Total.....	268,718	75,000	193,718

If consideration is given to the net population increase of those fleeing to other countries and of other elements of obvious importance, the number of these refugees would probably exceed 200,000.

Actually, according to official sources the figure is 218,713, of whom 98,000 came from Libya and the remainder from Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Italian Somaliland. Another official source puts the figure at a maximum of 225,000 in 1946. In 1951 an additional 70,000 refugees arrived, mostly from Libya.

According to the sources mentioned above, the total influx of refugees year by year is the following:

	Number of refugees		Number of refugees
1941.....	34,000	1948.....	7,432
1942.....	30,000	1949.....	5,652
1943.....	35,000	1950.....	1,620
1944.....	3,000	1951.....	7,000
1945.....	15,000		
1946.....	52,000	Total.....	225,713
1947.....	35,000		

It is noteworthy that the refugees from Africa had for the greater part families with relatives in Italy and frequently had recourse to them for lodging and board so that on June 30, 1951, the refugees from Africa assisted in camps amounted to 3,023 while 1,875 were assisted outside the camps. These figures

refer to cases which are really pitiful and desperate to such an extent that the public welfare agency has been obliged to give them priority of attention.

The percentage of able-bodied men and hence a potential worker is particularly high among these refugees, as likewise is the percentage of specialized workers, especially in the field of agriculture. The reasons are obvious, as these people were chosen either by reason of good health or professional ability from the moment they departed for the colonies where they subsequently developed these capacities in the process of colonization.

Refugees from Dodecanese Islands

As is known, the Dodecanese Islands were given by the Peace Treaty to Greece. There were living in the islands in 1943 about 10,000 Italian citizens. At present time there remain only three persons with Italian citizenship. However, since several thousand of these people took Greek citizenship and since others went to other countries, the number of those refugees can be estimated at 5,000.

Refugees from Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia

It is difficult to make an exact estimate of the refugees in this category because their exodus began in noteworthy numbers in September 1943, while the official statistics which are only approximate because incomplete began with May 6, 1945. Therefore, the official figures of 115,000 should be increased to 170,000-190,000 to be closer to the facts.

With the territorial loss suffered by Italy and with the Yugoslav policy of expelling the Italians to replace them with persons of Slavic origin it is difficult to estimate the measure of migration by the difference in population between 1938 and 1948. It is noteworthy, however, that from the zone of Pola alone not less than 30,000 were expelled.

However, as has been said, about 115,000 of these refugees have obtained from the Ministry of the Interior the official recognition of refugee status. Of these 115,000, a total of 103,000 have already obtained Italian citizenship and it is hoped that the others can also obtain it soon.

The Ministry of Interior from February 1947 to May 31, 1951, has assisted 73,875 refugees from Venezia Giulia, of whom 27,151 were in camps. Until June 30, 1951, a total of 29,519 refugees from Venezia Giulia were assisted, of whom 14,979 were in camps and 14,540 were outside of camps.

The refugees from Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia constitute a category with a high percentage of specialized workers, especially in the field of industry. It is enough to mention the large number of workers coming from the shipyards of Pola, from the torpedo works of Fiume, the mines of Arsa, and the canning and liquor industries of Dalmatia.

The number of able-bodied men is 40,000, of which the greater part are unemployed.

Refugees from abroad

With the war a large number of Italians living abroad were obliged to repatriate, swelling the ranks of dislocated persons. They came to Italy, sometimes in groups and sometimes singly. They were never counted accurately and often it was impossible to count them at all. Hence, it is difficult to give precise figures; their number varies between 100,000 and 150,000 with the figure of 125,000 being a reliable estimate.

Their origins differ widely: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, eastern Germany, Greece, Rumania, Tunisia, Hungary.

It has not been possible to determine the percentage of able-bodied men, their degree of specialization, or other data because of the heterogeneous nature of this group.

A summary review of the situation is outlined in the following figures:

(a) Refugees from Africa.....	225,000
(b) Refugees from the Dodecanese Islands.....	5,000
(c) Refugees from Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia.....	155,000
(d) Refugees from abroad.....	125,000
Total.....	510,000

As stated above, only a limited number were accommodated in camps or about 28,000 of whom 3,000 were refugees from Africa and 15,000 from Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia.

In 1947, approximately 55,000 Italian refugees were maintained in 108 camps. Subsequently, the movement in the camps was the following:

	Admitted	Dismissed
1947.....	10,149	14,529
1948.....	14,883	20,624
1949.....	12,864	24,622
1950.....	7,487	9,826

June 30, 1951, a total of 28,585 of these persons were supported in 42 camps. In April 1951 the Italian administration was assigned the four following additional camps IRO:

Locality	Total number of refugees accommodated	Number of Italian refugees
Aversa.....	1,319	618
Capua.....	966	514
Pontecagnano (S. Antonio).....	434	86
Mercatello.....	324	163
Total.....	3,043	1,181

All in all, there are an additional 40,000 assisted by the Italian Government outside the camps.

Assistance to refugees

The Government public welfare agencies and many private institutions, among which are many American relief agencies in Italy (the chief American relief agencies are WRS, NCWC, AJDC) are now dedicated to the assistance of refugees. Placement services, unemployment assistance, miscellaneous aid, relief distribution (for example, on the occasion of the arrival in Italy of the Friendship Train, the National Organization for Relief Distribution (ENDSI) in Italy distributed approximately 9,000 food parcels in the refugee camps), and other assistance have amounted to only a momentary alleviation of the tragic situation without resolving the radical problem of the resettlement of these refugees which remains a very serious problem.

Excluding other entries which refer in various ways to this assistance in the Federal budget, in the budget of independent regional agencies and various welfare agencies and excluding the Italian contribution to IRO, it is worthy of note that the Italian Government had appropriations in the budget for refugee assistance in the following figures:

	<i>Lire</i>
Period 1946-47	5,957,143,165
Period 1947-48.....	9,404,563,714
Period 1948-49.....	8,951,580,940
Period 1949-50.....	8,454,248,039

PERSONS DISPLACED BY THE WAR (EXCLUDING REFUGEES FROM NONMETROPOLITAN TERRITORY)

It is not easy to give even a broad estimate of this category of persons for obvious reasons; for example, the examination of a condition of such proportions and fluidity, especially during the war years, presented practically insurmountable difficulties at that time. However, it is possible to form a fairly exact idea of the proportion of the problem on the basis of the several following considerations.

From a joint study made in September 1944, by the Cabinet Council, the Central Institute of Statistics, and the Allied Mission in Italy, the majority of the municipalities contained in the 38 provinces of central, southern, and insular Italy covered approximately 48 percent of the territorial surface of Italy, 43 percent of the total population, 48 percent of the dwellings, 35 percent of resi-

dent rooms, and it is to be noted that at that time there was the following destruction of the war to dwellings (rooms unoccupied):

Number of rooms destroyed.....	484, 222
Number of rooms seriously damaged.....	145, 002
Number of rooms damaged.....	131, 005
Number of rooms lightly damaged.....	436, 082
Total.....	1, 196, 311

If to these are added the undamaged rooms in apartments where some rooms were destroyed and which certainly received some light damage (broken windows and fixtures and other losses) and because they were part of an apartment partially destroyed they were consequently only partly habitable—the number of which amounted to 179,030—the total of rooms destroyed or damaged in the war at that time and in the towns pooled rises to 1,375,341 or approximately 13 percent of prewar rooms and approximately 300,000 dwellings of which about 130,000 had been cleared of occupants. Of these 300,000 dwellings a little more than 150,000 were in provincial capitals and the remainder in other towns.

With the average occupancy of dwellings (at least 1 to 7 persons per room in the zone of Italy under examination) the number of persons who lost their homes as a result of the war was no less than 2,300,000 at that time and in the zone under examination.

Many of these persons who lost their homes in the war increased the already considerable number of those who had previously left their home and native town for various practical reasons. All of this population moved to those regions which were more out of the way, thus evading enumeration and often the numbering made for ration cards, living crowded in schools, homes of relatives and temporary shelters. The greater part of these people lost their jobs and all contact with their native town and remain today in the towns in which they took refuge, increasing sharply the number of those forced by circumstances to live on the outskirts of the cities and apart from the city life.

As explained, there was never any successful count made of these people; the count referred above amounts to 364,706 persons (of whom 203,013 were women) as displaced from other towns, but it is certain that at that time and in that zone, in order to be close to the facts the total should be doubled.

To attempt a safe estimate of all those in Italy who lost their home the figure would be approximately 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 of whom 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 are displaced in other towns. Of these latter from 1 million to 1½ million can be considered as dislocated persons.

EMIGRATION

As has already been said the Italian population increases by approximately 400,000 to 450,000 persons annually and every year 200,000 additional citizens seek employment.

A considerable outlet for the Italian demographic increase in the past was emigration, which some years actually exceeded the natural population increase: e. g., in 1930 there was a total of 872,598 emigrants (which amounted to 2.5 percent of the entire population). It is calculated that in this century alone approximately 7 million Italians emigrated to countries overseas and that about one half of these emigrants were permanent emigrants. Of these latter 3½ million persons, about 2 million found residence in the United States and 1 million in Argentina. The total number of Italians abroad is estimated today at not less than 8 million.

During the war emigration stopped almost entirely, except for several hundred thousand persons who emigrated temporarily to Germany while the call to arms gave rise to the serious situation of the veterans which was to contribute to disorganizing the Italian economy, already sorely tried by the war.

At the end of the war, with the return of the prisoners and veterans, with the loss of possessions, the great number of persons who would have been able to emigrate and which had been absorbed in the aforementioned employments was thrown on the Italian labor market.

The number of would-be emigrants to which reference was made above may be computed as follows on the basis of a yearly average of 150,000 (including repatriated):

Emigration backlog: Period 1925-50 (25 times 150,000)-----	3,750,000
Actual emigration, approximately-----	750,000
Total-----	3,000,000

or about 3,000,000 persons who could have emigrated abroad but who instead were left to aggravate the national economic situation.

In the years following the war the emigration rate has begun to recover with different characteristics, but at a pace irregular and inadequate to absorb the considerable backlog as will be seen better below. According to latest data, the difference between emigrants and refugees is around 150,000 annually.

For a correct interpretation of the tables furnishing data on the emigration movement abroad the two following facts are to be borne in mind:

(a) The concept of emigrant from the statistical point of view has not been the same. Until 1927 only manual workers who emigrated temporarily or permanently were considered emigrants. From 1928 to 1946 there were included in the emigrant category manual and intellectual workers who emigrated for reasons of employment. Finally since 1947 there have been included those who emigrated for reasons of employment or to establish their residence abroad. As a result the statistics of the various periods are not strictly comparable, but they are always useful, especially as an indication of trends;

(b) The computation of emigrants and repatriates traveling overland has been suspended in recent years because of the lack of an adequate system for examining the situation. At the present time coupons are being attached to passports to be removed at the moment of emigration or repatriation of the emigrant and until they are applied to all passports the relevant data cannot be computed with sufficient precision and elaborated. Complete figures are available, therefore, only for emigrants traveling by sea. However, on the basis of data obtained from various sources it is possible to reconstruct the approximate rate of emigration movement into Europe in the last 5 years. In the absence of figures on the repatriates from Switzerland we have estimated their number on the same percentage of these expatriates for the previous 2 years.

Proportion between farm population and arable land

Country	Farm population		Arable land		Farm population per 100 hectares of arable land
	Year	Thousands of inhabitants	Year	Hundreds of hectares	
Italy.....	1936	8,843	1936	12,947	63
Germany.....	1933	10,612	1937	21,381	50
France.....	1931	7,710	1936	21,134	36
Russia.....	1926	71,735	1934	223,916	32
Spain.....	1920	4,538	1935	15,770	29
Sweden.....	1930	1,041	1936	3,739	28
England.....	1931	1,175	1936	5,213	23
United States of America.....	1920	10,753	1926	129,438	8
Australia.....	1937	567	1935-36	11,875	5

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment in Italy has followed the course summarized for the last 28 years in the table appearing below. These data show that unemployment from a minimum of a little less than 3 per thousand of the population in 1925 and 1926 reached a maximum in 1948 of 47 per thousand.

Unemployment in the last 2 years has decreased slightly. It is especially noteworthy that the considerable increase in unemployment immediately after the war brought the percentage in 1946 to about 148 percent of that in the worst preceding year (1933) and to about 268 percent of that for the period of 1940-41. The situation became progressively worse until 1948. The explanation of this phenomenon has been adequately presented in the preceding paragraph.

The statistics given in this report are the official figures, lower than the actual facts insofar as only those persons registered in placement offices are considered, and because of the technical difficulty of enumerating them the following groups are passed over (as was also observed in the Survey on Italy's Economy, published by the UNRRS Missions in 1947) :

(a) Those thinking it useless to register and preferring to seek work on their own;

(b) Those not registered through ignorance, material impossibility (distance from the office or other reasons) or through lack of confidence in the usefulness of registering.

In addition the statistics do not include—

(1) Those not engaged in an independent activity who are nevertheless unemployed;

(2) A large part of those partially unemployed and of those practically unemployed who are engaged in some occasional gainful activity;

(3) Over-employment or the situation in which in a determined productive activity (and this happens often in agriculture and industry) there are normally and by mutual agreement a larger number of persons employed than are technically necessary;

(4) Obligatory employment, not technically, necessary, i. e., the high rate of labor imposed by the Government or by mayors in certain regions and at certain times of the year.

On the other hand, it is possible that the above figure could include duplicate registrations of persons not completely unemployed, but the present system of strict and repeated checking renders this possibility very unlikely. As a matter of fact, a recent estimate published by the economic commission for Europe (ECE) puts the total number of unemployed Italians to about 4 million. Therefore, even if a more modest estimate was given, the figures for Italian postwar unemployment issued in the official statistics can be increased at least 60 to 70 percent.

In the absence, therefore, of more precise data, the official statistics, which are certainly a good indication of the trend of the situation, will be employed in the considerations that follows.

First of all, according to the latest international surveys, it is observed that Italian unemployment is among the highest in the world in the absolute sense and the highest if related to the resident population or the productive population. By way of illustration the following table, on the basis of official figures, with reference to the productive population, is adduced, as this relationship seems to be the more significant.

This table shows that even though Italy succeeds in some degree in containing her unemployment it continually increases in the majority of other countries. The table follows without further explanation.

The distribution of unemployed in the various groups is broadly the following :

	Percent
Manual workers generally.....	20-25
Employed in agriculture.....	15-20
Employed in industry.....	50-55
Other groups.....	5-15

The following data are for 1950 :

	Registered	Percent
Agriculture.....	346,368	18.7
Industry.....	966,046	52.0
Transport and communications.....	18,853	1.0
Commerce.....	45,611	2.4
Credit and insurance.....	613
Manual workers generally.....	404,047	21.7
Office workers.....	58,371	4.2
Total.....	1,860,109	100.0

Another significant classification of the unemployed is that by classes. As of January 1950 the division is the following :

Class 1: Unemployed workers through loss of previous employment ;

Class 2: Those under 20 years of age, including those demobilized from military service seeking first employment ;

Class 3: Housewives seeking first employment;

Class 4: Pensioners seeking employment;

Class 5: Employed workers seeking different employment.

For 1949 and 1950 there is the following approximate division of the same classes:

[Percent]

	Total	Women only
Class 1.....	60-70	50
Class 2.....	15-25	15-22
Class 3.....	8-10	25-30
Class 4.....	2-5	1-2
Class 5.....	3	1

Altogether women represent one-third of all Italian unemployed.

In conclusion, it is to be noted that the extraordinary effort put forth by Italy with the generous assistance of UNRRA and with the interim aid of EKP has succeeded in redeeming for the most part the grave social and economic situation resulting from the war, which was a war lost, and in supporting the greater part of the social and demographic problem. However, there still remains the settlements of at least two or three million persons which the labor market cannot completely absorb, as it is already pressed to meet new demands for employment by those coming of working age.

At least 2 million persons belonging to class 1 must find permanent employment outside Italy to prevent the already serious social and economic situation from becoming more grave. It must be borne in mind that Italian agriculture no longer has any capacity for absorbing additional labor and that hundreds of thousands of persons would be forced to accept the wretched life of the agricultural day laborer in Italy—the tragic human and social consequences of which are related so frequently in the press—if other vast and generous lands will not demonstrate that they have governments and peoples equally generous and vast in vision capable of sparing Italy, Europe, and the world the tragic consequences that would be the fatal conclusion of the wounded brotherhood of man.

CONCLUSION

Europe, and particularly Italy, cannot recover so long as millions of Europeans are decaying in a demoralizing idleness for lack of opportunity to work and the chance to build normal family life. Europe cannot find peace so long as these millions, called into being by violent and inhuman upheavals, sow the seeds of discontent, disturbance, and revenge. The problem of overpopulation is far beyond the scope of charity, and requires immediate and effective effort on the part of governments, which must go much further in their legislative and economic provisions for the acceptance of these lost millions.

When the so-called Marshall plan was initiated we sincerely tried to bolster the civilian economies of the various nations. Recently, because of the threats of war, our aid has changed its character. What has happened to our plans for peace—have we again failed to penetrate the root of the matter? Our Nation, which has taken the lead in aid to so many farflung areas of the world, which is bolstering the military establishments of so many areas of tension, which is sharing its technical skills with countries that are underdeveloped for lack of know-how, should add a fourth project—a project that would show its vision and concern for the welfare of the individual.

Governments will not act unless they are pressed by people who are able to measure the depths of all the individual tragedies which befall these bewildered millions. Will we silence the voice of our conscience and refuse to understand the grief of these victims of inhumanity and fall before God and history to provide the leadership that will alleviate their fate by efficient help?

(Sources consulted: Report, Council of Europe, 1951; Istituto Centrale di Statistica Italiana; selected papers, N. C. W. C.; Abbott on Historical Aspects of Immigration; Rev. Aloysius J. Wycislo on Our Interest in Displaced Persons, etc., September 1951; and other authorities.)

KOHLER, WIS., June 2, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building:

Senate bill 1917 is the first step toward destruction of our wise immigration laws. It offers the big chance for Communist-dominated countries to send in subversives to the detriment of the United States. We have not succeeded in rounding up dangerous aliens who should have been deported long ago. We cannot expect 240,000 more to be adequately screened. Why should American boys be drafted while allowing Europe's surplus population to flock to our shores to take the jobs our boys have been forced to leave? We urge you to fight any and all attempts to alter or invalidate the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. Please include this telegram in the written hearings.

Mr. and Mrs. CARL J. KOHLER.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
Washington 5, D. C., May 29, 1953.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration,**Senate Committee on the Judiciary,**United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: As director of the department of immigration, National Catholic Welfare Conference, I desire to express the opinion of NCWC on a problem which I believe to be one of the most vital of our times. I have reference to the subcommittee's consideration of the Watkins bill, S. 1917.

It is the considered opinion of National Catholic Welfare Conference that S. 1917 embodies an honest recognition of the basic problems involved in the plight of the unfortunate victims of World War II and its aftermath. Committees of the Congress, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, have amassed a wealth of information on the subject matter encompassed by this proposed legislation. We are confident the members of the subcommittee are well aware of the many facets of the problem. We are certain they desire to deal with them in the light of traditional American generosity. We are equally certain the members of the subcommittee see in this legislation an excellent opportunity to implement the President's plans for peace and freedom throughout the world—and, at the same time, to still the strident voice of Communist propaganda which constantly proclaims that we are a people of words, but little action.

We concur in the views which have been expressed before the subcommittee by Rt. Rev. Edward E. Swannstrom, War Relief Services, NCWC, and Rev. William J. Gibbons, S. J., director of National Catholic Rural Life Conference. We join with them in their expressions of genuine concern for a satisfactory solution to the refugee problem which confronts the free nations.

National Catholic Welfare Conference sincerely hopes the subcommittee, at an early date, will report the Watkins bill with a recommendation of passage and thus demonstrate America's interest in those less fortunate than ourselves, while inspiring other free nations to cooperate with the United States in seeking a solution to this very grave problem.

Sincerely,

BRUCE M. MOHLER,

Director, Department of Immigration.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., May 29, 1953.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I do not approve of Senate bill 1917. Please include my communication in the hearing.

T. J. MORLEY.

COMMITTEE ON AMERICANISM,
NATIONAL SOJOURNERS, INC.,
Washington 6, D. C. May 27, 1953.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration,
Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: In connection with the hearings being held by the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, with respect to Senate bill 1917, to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special-quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes, it is desired to submit a brief statement setting forth the interest and position of National Sojourners, Inc., concerning this proposed legislation.

National Sojourners, Inc., composed of some 197 chapters distributed throughout the United States and its possessions, and at certain other places abroad, is an organization of master masons who are citizens of the United States and who are now serving or have served as commissioned or warrant officers of the United States, or of an Allied country in time of war.

Among the purposes of National Sojourners are the development of true patriotism and Americanism throughout the Nation and the opposing of any influence whatsoever calculated to weaken the national security. Based upon these purposes, and for the purpose of protecting the interests of all our citizens, of excluding foreign interests with ideologies at variance with our constitutional system of government, and of codifying and improving generally the immigration and naturalization laws of the country, this organization adopted a resolution at its 32d annual convention, at Baltimore, Md., on May 23, 1952, supporting the adoption of the McCarran-Walter immigration and naturalization bill, which was afterwards enacted into law.

At its 33d annual convention, just concluded at Los Angeles, Calif., May 21-23, 1953, National Sojourners adopted a resolution reaffirming its position in support of the legislation—now the McCarran-Walter Act—referred to. The convention adopted a further resolution, stating the opposition of National Sojourners to passage of the bill (S. 1917) now under consideration by your subcommittee, for the reason that it would affect a substantial change during the next several years in the quota system provided for in the McCarran-Walter Act.

There is inclosed, for the information of your subcommittee, a copy of the resolution regarding the McCarran-Walter bill adopted by National Sojourners at the annual convention at Baltimore in May 1952. This organization is opposed to any amendment or new legislation which would tend to emasculate that legislation or which would effect any substantial change in the quota system provided therein. I regret that copies of the resolutions adopted at the recent convention at Los Angeles are not available at this time for submission, due to the recent date of the convention and the fact that the proceedings are at present in transmittal. I shall be glad at a later date, however, to furnish copies of such resolutions, with the hope that they can be added to the record of your hearings on S. 1917.

May I respectfully request that your subcommittee and the Committee on the Judiciary give favorable consideration to the foregoing and report adversely on adoption of S. 1917; and that this letter be placed in the records of the hearings now being held by your subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. N. SCHULZ, *Chairman.*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NATIONAL SOJOURNERS, INC., AT THE 32D ANNUAL CONVENTION, BALTIMORE, MD., MAY 23, 1952

RESOLUTION NO. 9—RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE McCARRAN-WALTER BILL

Whereas there has been passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate, in slightly differing forms, the McCarran-Walter bill (S. 2550; H. R. 5678), effecting a much-needed codification and improvement of our immigration and naturalization laws, which legislation still requires final passage by the Congress and the approval of the President: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by National Sojourners, Inc., assembled in the 32d annual convention, at Baltimore, Md., on May 23, 1952, That for the purpose of protecting the interests of all our citizens, of excluding foreign interests with ideologies at variance with our constitutional system of government, and of codifying and improv-

ing generally the immigration and naturalization laws, this organization supports the provisions of the McCarran-Walter bill and urges its early final enactment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 11—RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE ENACTMENT OF S. 1917, 83D CONGRESS, OR OTHER SIMILAR LEGISLATION

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Act effected a much-needed codification and improvement of our immigration and naturalization laws and established a system of quotas for immigration; and

Whereas National Sojourners, Inc., in convention assembled in the city of Baltimore, Md., on May 23, 1952, adopted Resolution No. 9, supporting the legislation which became the McCarran-Walter Act; and

Whereas there was introduced in the Senate on May 15, 1953, a bill S. 1917, entitled "A bill to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes"; and

Whereas the said bill S. 1917 would, if enacted, create an exception to the quota immigration system, established by the McCarran-Walter Act; and

Whereas the enactment of the bill S. 1917 would, in the opinion of National Sojourners, Inc., be detrimental to the best interests of our citizens, by permitting entrance into the United States of persons possibly with ideologies at variance with our constitutional system of government which could constitute a threat to our security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by National Sojourners, Inc., assembled in the 33d annual convention, at Los Angeles, Calif., on May 22, 1953, That for the purpose of protecting the interests of all of our citizens, by excluding persons with ideologies at variance with our constitutional system of government, it opposes the enactment of S. 1917, or any other legislation which would, at this time, in any substantial degree modify, change, or in any way make exceptions to the quota immigration system established by the McCarran-Walter Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION ON EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION PRESENTED BY NEW JERSEY COUNCIL ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION, NEWARK, N. J.

Whereas the New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation has since its inception urged revision of our present immigration policy and specifically the McCarran Immigration Act, because of the many unjust, undesirable, and undemocratic provisions of the act, some of which are:

1. The national origins quota system;
2. Inequality of status given to naturalized citizens;
3. Lack of procedural and legal safeguards; and

Whereas since these necessary revisions are not being made in the present session of the Congress; and

Whereas among our concerns were the plight of refugees from the political and religious persecution; the plight of persons displaced as a result of World War II and economic displacement contributing to what is more commonly referred to as overpopulation; and

Whereas President Eisenhower, in addition to having pointed out the need for revision of our immigration legislation, has also recommended to the Congress that emergency legislation be enacted which will permit a flow of immigration to aid in the relief of the problems referred to above; and

Whereas the United States has traditionally been a haven of hope for the oppressed and distressed and as such has been a symbol of mankind's highest aspirations, and therefore has indicated to all peoples the superiority of the free world over that of totalitarian despotism; and

Whereas the adoption of emergency immigration legislation to admit 240,000 persons at this time would further reaffirm our good will and would relate directly to the ability and will of our allies to meet the threat of international communism: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation, reiterating its position in favor of revision of our present immigration laws, at the same time supports and encourages the immediate passage of emergency immigration legislation which will provide for the entry in the United States of 240,000 persons including refugees from totalitarian tyranny; persons who were displaced as a result of World War II and economically displaced persons from allied nations which are considered to be overpopulated; and be it further

Resolved, That categories of persons to be admitted by means of such emergency immigration legislation shall not be on the basis of the national origins, but shall instead be based on the following criteria:

1. Right of asylum;
2. Reunion of families;
3. Needs in the United States;
4. Special needs in the free world; and be it further

Resolved, That the New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation shall forward copies of this resolution forthwith to the appropriate legislative committee as well as to the president and members of the New Jersey delegation in Congress.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, June 5, 1953.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: I am writing to you and appealing to you as a voter and ardent worker in the Republican Party in the State of Utah to uphold and keep the McCarran-Walter bill. I am desperately opposed for the United States to allow 240,000 aliens to come into the United States.

Please include my communication in the written hearings. The Daughters of the American Revolution always carry out the principles of national defense to protect our Republic.

Respectfully yours,

ERMA B. THOMAS
Mrs. Arthur S. Thomas,
State Regent of Utah, Daughters of the American Revolution.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, June 2, 1953.

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: I am opposed to Senate bill 1917.

I do not believe escapees are a good political risk and they are a very poor financial risk. Therefore, I ask that you vote against this bill.

Please include my protest in the written hearings.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

MARGARET THORNTON
Mrs. Henry W. Thornton.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS AND ARGYLE R. MACKAY, COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

JUNE 9, 1953.

COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
Department of Justice, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to invite your attention to the following testimony taken on May 27, 1953, by the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization in regard to S. 1917, a bill to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special-quota immigrant visas:

"Dr. ELLIOTT (of the Church World Service). * * * And what Mr. Arens has said about the fact that we have not, so far as I know, deported a single person for either security reasons——

"Mr. ARENS. They have had 2,000 warrants out on subversive and criminal activities of all kinds.

"Dr. ELLIOTT. And, of course, some of those are just investigational warrants, are they not?

"Mr. ARENS. That is right.

"Dr. ELLIOTT. But not one single person has been deported out of that number.

"Mr. ARENS. That DP program in that respect was atrocious. You ought to read the report.

"Senator WELKER. What happened to it?

"Mr. ARENS. The full Judiciary Committee came out with a report, approved unanimously, to the effect that there was a complete breakdown in the administration of it. That is the trouble here. We have to be very cautious on anything of this character.

"Senator WELKER. How many in the 1948 act?

"Mr. ARENS. Altogether we brought in over 400,000, close to 500,000, including the German ethnics.

"Dr. ELLIOTT. But the 2,000 does not mean that those cases have been proved, does it?

"Mr. ARENS. No."

The testimony quoted above had reference to the operation of the so-called displaced-persons program and the work of the Displaced Persons Commission and its officers and employees.

I would appreciate it if you will respond as quickly as possible to the following questions:

(1) How many warrants were issued on the basis of subversive or criminal activities in respect to persons brought into the United States under the displaced-persons program?

(2) What was the breakdown as to offenses in respect to the cases on which warrants were issued?

(3) What disposition was made of the cases in which warrants were issued?

I will appreciate it if you will promptly provide me with the answers to the questions stated above in such form and with the understanding that they may be released for publication.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
Washington 25, D. C., June 17, 1953.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: This will acknowledge your letter of June 9, 1953, in which you raise certain specific questions concerning the number of warrants of arrests issued in the case of persons admitted to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

In reading over your quotations from the testimony, I should like to call attention to the fact that Mr. Arens stated that there have been 2,000 warrants of arrest issued on criminal and subversive activities of all kinds. Our figures would indicate that this statement was not intended to apply only to persons admitted under the displaced persons program. During the first 10 months of this fiscal year (July 1, 1952, to April 30, 1953), there have been 2,292 investigations of displaced persons.

In reply to your specific questions, there have been 33 warrants of arrest issued on subversive or criminal charges. The enclosed table indicates the breakdown of the charges with reference to the cases on which warrants were issued and no final decision has been made. There have been 3 deportations and 2 voluntary departures of displaced persons. Thirteen cases have been terminated after the warrant of arrest was issued.

If we can be of any further assistance, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

ARGYLE R. MACKEY, *Commissioner.*

Persons admitted to the United States as displaced persons for whom warrants of arrest have been issued, by charge¹

Charge:	Number of cases
Subversive or anarchistic.....	2
Criminals.....	31
Mental or physical defectives.....	62
Visa procured by fraud or misrepresentation.....	67
Likely to become public charge.....	46
Miscellaneous.....	26
Total.....	234

¹ Table does not include deportations and terminated cases.

Source: Statistics Branch, Administrative Division, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice.

MAINE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Bangor, Maine, June 30, 1953.

Senator FREDERICK PAYNE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: I understand that you have placed your name on Senate bill 1917, which will undermine the McCarran-Walter immigration law, and as a voter in Maine I ask you to reconsider your position.

In that, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, "an analysis of approximately 5,000 of the more militant members of the Communist Party shows that 91.5 percent of them were either of foreign birth, married to persons of foreign birth, or born of foreign parents, and that over half of them traced their origins to Russia or to her satellite countries," such a report should be a warning to us all that we have enough of these people already in the United States.

These people will take jobs away from Americans, take the jobs of our American boys who have been drafted to fight in foreign lands. These people will soon become eligible for social security, aid for the aged, and unemployment insurance, more burdens for the already overburdened American taxpayer.

For these reasons I urge you to vote against Senate bill 1917, and please include my communication in the written hearings.

Very truly yours,

DORIS PIKE WHITE.
Mrs. Ashmead White.

×